**66-3044**

SHEIL, Marion Dorinda, 1921–
LIBRARY SERVICES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF OHIO, 1955-1963.

Western Reserve University
Ph.D., 1965
Library Science

**LIBRARY SERVICES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL OF OHIO**

**1955-1963**

**MRION** DORINDA SHEIL

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements**

**for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**Department of Education**

**WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY**

**February 1965**

**WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY**

**THE GRADUATE** SCHOOL

**We hereby approve the thesis of**

**MARION** DORINDA SHEIL

**candidate for the** DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY **degree.**

*Clarence B. Allan*
Chairman

*George Kummer, Ph. D.*

*Daniel C. Biebuw, Ph. D.*

*Otto Sheridan*

*Richie Brown.*

**Date** *Jan. 15, 1965*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere thanks to the high school principals and many librarians who gave generously of their time and experience providing data for this eight-year study of the school libraries in Ohio. The participation of those principals who evaluated their libraries according to the standards of the American Library Association was especially valuable.

Credit is given to the Misses Frances Goff, Marie Hegedus, Carolynn Fischer, and Diane Dillon for typing the manuscript, and for related clerical services.

A major share of credit is attributed to Dr. C. B. Allen who sponsored the study and guided this student with patience, precision and great wisdom. The writer is deeply grateful for his exemplary teaching as well as his penetrating insight into library problems.

Special tribute is accorded the writer's mother, Dorinda, for her continuous support and encouragement, and to her brother, Robert, for his interest and confidence.

This dissertation is dedicated to the students who depend upon libraries, and particularly to Mary Jo, Judith, and Thomas, the nieces and nephew of the writer.

iii

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

## Introduction

Library services in the modern secondary school are recognized
by most educators as fundamental to a sound program of teaching and
learning. The concept of the library's direct relationship to the edu-
cational objectives of the school is not of recent origin, but an in-
creasing awareness of this consociation is clearly evident from the com-
ments of educational leaders, by the adoption of higher standards for
school libraries, the initiation of nationally-sponsored school library
projects to implement the standards, sequent legislation providing addi-
tional funds for materials and improved services, and from the widespread
concern of students and their parents in their search for information.

In 1961, school administrators pronounced their interpretation
of the cardinal role of the library in the following policy statement:

> The school library is intrinsic to the purposes of the school
> and is, therefore, a basic service for which the board of edu-
> cation is responsible.[1]

James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, when
reporting his preliminary findings of a one-year study of American junior
high schools at the annual conference of the American Association of

---

[1] Responsibilities of State Departments of Education for School
Library Services: A Policy Statement. Council of Chief State School
Officers, 1961. School Library Development Project, March 1962,
JN 25477, p. 2.

1

School Administrators in February, 1961, included among his recommendations:

> A well-stocked central library with a full-time librarian for every junior high school.

It is significant that these statements were issued within a year after the American Library Association standards for school libraries were revised by a group of librarians and other educators, and were generally accepted as the best guides available for estimating qualitative and quantitative needs of the school library for quality education.

Over twenty years ago, when our population increase was accelerating and the need for new knowledge was felt, the following observation realistically expressed the goals for the school library of the early 1960's:

> From being a mere collection of books, the modern school library is rapidly becoming the coordinating center of the entire instructional program, with service to pupils and teachers representing the keynote of its operation.[1]

The same source forecast in essence, if not in detail, the pressures of the moment, and the current school library needs:

> Newer trends and responsibilities place added burdens upon the school library.[2]

Between the lines is perceived the challenge to librarians to serve students and teachers through cooperative selection of printed, filmed and electronically-recorded materials, organization and interpretation of such materials, and responsibility for promoting their use.

Today's high school students are victims of the frustrating

---

[1]Maurice M. Smith, L. L. Standley, and Cecil L. Hughes, *Junior High School Education* (New York and London: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1942), p. 270.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 296.

circumstances of which they are, in part, both cause and effect. After
World War II, the birth rate began its climb toward unprecedented
heights. More schools were constructed to house the educational processes
needed for all pupils. Many of these facilities are already outgrown,
thereby requiring new construction and additions to existing buildings.
School libraries have grown, developed, and changed, but only at the
pace and in the direction each school has allowed.

With the population explosion there came an explosion of knowl-
edge. Sputnik and Telstar are the contemporary symbols of man's achieve-
ment in science and communication. World communications improved because
men of all countries had information to share and problems to solve
requiring the sharing of the experience and research. With this inter-
play of ideas, knowledge increased and modern man discovered that sci-
ence could automate tedious processes thus allowing more time for learn-
ing better ways to overcome barriers to progress and the advancement of
information.

The concept of the student has transcended the image of a lad
going to school with a textbook latched to his bookstrap. A student is
now conceived as anyone who is seeking knowledge in a purposeful way.
Workers in many fields are retraining to achieve new skills in order to
acquire affluence and, eventually, to elevate cultural and intellectual
standards. Intellectual activity has spurred the publication of books
and magazines to a new peak, and the cost of all printed materials has
risen disproportionately higher than the national cost of living. More-
over, the need for these tools of information spirals throughout society.
Home libraries are being developed, and more students are using libraries
wherever libraries are open to them.

4

Increases in enrollment, world-wide growth of knowledge, curricular changes, and vast increases in printed materials along with their rising costs, the advent of educational television and other teaching media, the handicaps of out-of-date book collections, and a lack of sufficient numbers of adequately trained library staff are some of the reasons for increased concern.

Public libraries are often unable to accommodate the growing numbers of students making excessive demands on available space and materials. It has forced many libraries to limit student-use in the interest of serving the entire community.

> In one city, Baltimore, the Deiches Study reports that fifty-five
> per cent of library patrons were using the Enoch Pratt Library
> for school-related purposes.[1]

Although no comparable study has been made in Ohio, the figure parallels personal estimates made by a number of librarians in the Cleveland area.

Students use many different libraries and their parents have often assumed the role of co-workers with their children in the search for school-related materials, frequently traveling considerable distances to obtain the information. Research libraries and large public collections are being misused by students whose needs should be better met by adequate facilities in their own school libraries. Inadequacies can usually be explained by lack of funds or by inadequate staff, or both.

Educators in the library field are deeply concerned about the quantitative and qualitative problems concerned with training personnel

---

[1] Unpublished paper: Frank L. Schick, Henry T. Drennan, Mary Helen Mahar and Theodore Samore, Staff of the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education, "Assessing the Availability and Accessibility of Resources to Meet Student Needs." Conference within a Conference, American Library Association, July, 1963. Background Paper Topic 1, p. 8.

to handle the needs of youth.

Is there any apparent visible relief from the quantitative burden in education? On the contrary, the rise in the birth rate means that millions of young people will come flocking to our school house doors, and that thousands of new teachers will be needed to instruct them. Rapid advances in technology will demand increasingly higher levels of education if we are not to be overburdened with the unemployed. We may anticipate even greater expansions in the numbers of high schools, vocational institutes, and junior and community colleges, all demanding more teachers, more equipment and more physical plant. What will happen to educational standards under such pressures? When education most desperately needs reappraisal and renovation, we may be unable to provide it. One can scarcely view the prospect of the future without deep sense of alarm. Yet the qualitative problem of education must be solved if our technology is not to create an environment in which mankind is unable to survive.[1]

The literature since 1960 reflects not only an attitude of great concern for handling the educational needs of youth but of need for great effort being exerted toward certain definite goals and a movement for quality for school librarians.

The library will become the major resource and center for learning activities. To carry out this concept, library functions and procedures must be redefined. The resources offered will include not only books in abundance but also microfilms, charts, recordings, filmstrips, videotapes, and other materials to whet the appetite for learning and to feed the hunger for understanding.[2]

School libraries must not only be clearly defined, they must become progressively comprehensive within that definition. Educators who revised the standards for school libraries outlined requirements and assigned continuing responsibility to librarians, school administrators,

---

[1]Jesse H. Shera, "Staffing Library Services to Meet Student Needs," Library Education Background Paper, Topic 4, No. 2, Conference within a Conference, American Library Association, July, 1963, p. 1.

[2]Sara Innis Fenwick, New Definitions of School-Library Service. Papers Presented before the Twenty-fourth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, August 10-12, 1959 (Chicago, Illinois, 1960). Composed and printed by the University of Chicago Press for the Library Quarterly. p. 8.

and indeed society in general.

> To work continuously toward excellence in providing students and teachers with the resources of teaching and learning that they need, is a good investment for the community.[1]

## General Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to evaluate services in secondary school libraries of Ohio, and to determine the impact of these services upon the students and teachers. It also seeks to promote a general upgrading of services by presenting a synthesis of better library practices in selected schools.

The A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs, adopted by educators as the national guide for providing services, are the criteria used by many Ohio schools for adequate libraries, but there is no objective estimate of the influence of secondary school libraries, with their numerous innate differences, on the quality of education in Ohio, and no appraisal of the values of the school library with respect to the development of each student's potential.

It is known that many school libraries are presently operating under serious handicaps; the most evident ones are the lack of sufficient kinds and numbers of qualified personnel, inadequate and inappropriate space, dearth of up-to-date materials, and the presence of a confused attitude concerning the kinds of materials and the ways in which the library should serve the school. These conditions were found in Georgia, Arkansas, West Virginia and Nevada, and were doubtless common in other

---

[1]American Library Association, Standards for School Library Programs (Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1960), p. 7.

states.[1]

The present study also attempts to analyze the conditions which make certain library programs more effective; to identify specific factors which are barriers to effective services; and to reveal some of the underlying causes for their existence and persistence.

The third purpose is to recommend a program for improvement of library services for the high school students and teachers of Ohio based upon the professional knowledge and experiences of librarians and principals in Ohio's public high schools.

## Need for the Study

For several reasons, the need for the study is not likely to be questioned. First of all, knowledge of the effectiveness of school library services in Ohio exists in the minds of all school personnel. This information should be brought together for a study of its implications and direct information of value to others. Secondly, the ideas of potential services through the school library should be clarified, re-emphasized, and modernized for teachers, librarians, students and the taxpayers of Ohio. These are especially important at this time of demand for rapid change in the curriculum content and methods. Thirdly, frustrations need to be replaced by action programs designed to implement the advancement toward meeting the general demand for quality and greater excellence.

Another reason for the study is to help administrators and

---

[1]Mary Frances Kennon and Leila Ann Doyle, _Planning School Library Development_, School Library Development Project, 1962. American Association of School Librarians, a Division of the American Library Association, a department of the National Education Association (Chicago: American Library Association, 1962), Chapters II and III.

librarians interpret their own needs and see their problems as a challenge for action instead of a hopeless situation, or one which time alone can alter. It is a premise to the study that every school library gives valuable service but in most cases, service can and should be improved.

Finally, a systematic search of the professional literature has failed to reveal a single, up-to-date report of school library services in Ohio to support, negate, or qualify the findings of 1949[1] supplied by the State Department of Education.

## Statement of the Problem

The present study attempts to investigate five aspects of secondary school library services in Ohio. Specifically, it seeks (1) to ascertain the present services afforded by the school libraries of the state, particularly by comparing data gathered in 1949, 1956 and 1963; (2) to analyze the methods and kinds of services, including an examination of the nature of the staff and their general duties; (3) to study other factors concomitant to library service, namely, materials and facilities; (4) to identify and analyze developments and trends related to technological advances, the conservation of human resources through cooperative efforts, and to suggest some untested ways of getting things done; and (5) to summarize the general status and trends of school library services with respect to the stated functions of school library programs, patterns of library supervision and appropriate patterns of communications, and to offer suggestions for the improvement of the services, especially to the students and teachers of the schools.

[1]Isabel Nolan and John H. Herrick, "What Is the Status of Library Service in Ohio Schools?" Ohio Schools (May, 1949), pp. 220-221.

## Scope of Investigation

In the present study, the concept of services as performed by public high school libraries, includes the obligations, functions, programs, or responsibilities related to the selection, procurement, organization and maintenance of materials of instruction and their interpretation; use of these materials in the process of reference, reading guidance, and library instruction; the promotion of services through effective communication within the school, between libraries, and throughout the community as prescribed and approved by the superintendent, the principal, or the Board of Education. The specific areas selected for study include two major responsibilities in the general area of library administration, four in the area of direct service, and two in the field of communications.

Under administration are: (1) the organization of library materials with emphasis of the concept of a "materials center," and (2) the responsibility for providing "technical services."

In the area of direct service to students and teachers, the following are treated: (1) reading guidance, (2) library instruction, and (3) curriculum enrichment through teacher-librarian teamwork. In the field of communications and cooperation are: (1) promotion of the school library program, and (2) affiliations of the school library with state, public, and college libraries.

The study which originally began during the school year of 1955-1956 includes public secondary school libraries in Ohio cities, in county local schools and in exempted villages. The secondary schools include those enrolling grades 7 through 12 in any combination recognized by the Ohio State Department of Education. All schools including specialized

types such as vocational, adult, night, technical, and summer high schools
are included. In 1956, 1,138 schools were sent the first questionnaire.

During the fall of 1963, 149 schools previously surveyed were
sent the second questionnaire to provide data especially related to as-
certain growth and change during the intervening eight-year period.
Sixty other libraries in new schools established since 1955 were also
surveyed by questionnaires in 1963. Letters and conferences with prin-
cipals and librarians in 1964 completed the accumulation of data. In
all, over 1,347 school contacts were made between May, 1956, and Febru-
ary, 1964. Principals and librarians shared in the reporting. In the
earlier survey, principals were asked to have the head of their library
complete the data requested. In the two more recent surveys, the prin-
cipals were asked to sign the questionnaires and were asked for their
personal opinions and evaluations of the services. On many, if not al-
most all of the questionnaires returned, the librarian shared in prepar-
ing the reply, although the principals answered the questions relating
to school philosophy, policies and communications.

## Plan of Presentation

In Chapter II, the professional literature related to the study
is reviewed. In Chapter III, the data on public high school libraries
in 1956 are analyzed and presented.

Chapter IV affords an analysis of the more recent, 1963, mate-
rials collected, treating first, the status of library services of
schools previously surveyed; then the more detailed rating on materials,
facilities, personnel and services in selected schools evaluated by the
principals according to A.L.A. Standards; then a report on new school
libraries. Chapter V compares the school libraries in 1956 and 1963

with emphasis upon the instructional materials center, and an evaluation
of Ohio's program of communication and cooperation. Chapter VI, the
final chapter, summarizes the major findings and conclusions and affords
certain recommendations.

# CHAPTER II

## RELATED STUDIES

### General Concepts of School Library Services

One of the major factors preventing a better understanding of the role of the school library has been the variance found in the concepts of its functions. The role of the library was influenced in no small measure by the rapidly changing educational patterns, the nature of the local environment, the librarian's ability, enthusiasm and personal philosophy, and by the principal's knowledge of current library standards, and his attitude toward a developmental and dynamic library program.

Maturation of the modern program of library services may be observed through comparison of the developmental stages of library standards, the conditions precursing their adoption, and the activities which followed. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, trends in education have affected standards, and in turn, standards have promoted new goals. Fargo believed in establishing standards to guide constructively the efforts of those responsible for giving school library service.

In the library, as elsewhere, reach may well exceed grasp; objectives and standards are the compasses by which the course is set.[1]

---

[1]Lucile F. Fargo, The Library in the School (Chicago: American Library Association, 1947), p. 27.

Libraries have been formulating and evaluating standards for al-
most fifty years, and t e professional literature reflects intermittent
emphasis on that subject since 1918. Attempts to improve school libraries
through an appraisal of their composite strengths and weaknesses have
resulted in the formulation of various instruments of measurement and
evaluation to guide and direct the course of action for planning, stock-
ing, and staffing these areas of educational service.

### Interpreting the Standards

The remainder of the present chapter is divided into four parts.
The first part is an introduction to the early national standards under
the title: Significance of Standards for Secondary School Library
Development in Ohio. The second part continues the analysis of stand-
ards adopted during an era of investigation; it is called The Search for
Qualitative Norms for Evaluating School Libraries. The third part is
largely an evaluation described by its title, The Progress of Ohio's
Secondary School Standards as They Pertain to the Library Program. Sec-
tion A compares library statistics and administrators' opinions concern-
ing the quality of library service with the standards representative of
the 'forties and 'fifties. Section B is called "Ohio's Approach to the
A.L.A.'s Standards for School Library Programs, 1960." The fourth and
last part consists of a presentation of selected Recent Efforts to Im-
prove Library Services for Students and Teachers by reviewing factors
of school library development in several states while noting their im-
plications for Ohio. Because of inherent similarities of the conditions
of library service in Baltimore and Greater Cleveland, considerable

attention is given to the purposes and findings of the Deiches Fund
Study No. 1: "Students and the Pratt Library: Challenge and Opportu-
nity."

<div align="center">Part I</div>

### Significance of Standards for Secondary School Library
### Development in Ohio

The earliest report on school library standards in the United
States which appeared in 1918, was prepared by the Secondary School
Department of the National Education Association and by the Library Com-
mittee of the North Central Association.[1]

The Library Committee studied conditions in high school libraries
and reported the findings at a national meeting of high-school principals,
teachers, librarians, and state and city superintendents. From this ac-
tivity emerged a new concept of the status of the library in the school,
and the action of the various organizations gave school administrators
the first set of national standards for high school library development.

More significantly, the early standards presented certain goals
yet unrealized in Ohio. Jesse Newlon's memorable statement was beamed
so as to stimulate the establishment of adequate school library facili-
ties to serve as a pattern for others to follow:

There are few well-planned high school libraries in the
United States. Sometimes there is a large study hall for the

---

[1]National Education Association, Committee on Library Organiza-
tion and Equipment, Standard Library Organization and Equipment for
Secondary Schools of Different Sizes. (Commonly known as the Certain
Report from the name of the chairman of the committee responsible for
the survey on which the standards were based. This report was accepted
by the National Education Association in 1918.) Addresses and Proceed-
ings, Vol. LII, 1918, 802 pp.

library--generally just one room with no workroom or convenience
of any kind for the library staff . . . in the science depart-
ment we have had definite standards by which to design. These
standards have been worked out during many years in the colleges
and secondary schools. . . . It has been easy, therefore, to
convince boards of education that it is necessary to provide
these. We have been able to take boards of education to neigh-
boring cities and show them what has been done, but we have
been unable to do that in the library field.[1]

Newlon's practical observations influenced not only the school-
men of his era but may have induced the members of the American Associa-
tion of School Librarians[2] to seek funds from the Knapp Foundation for a
five-year project (1963-1967) to demonstrate the educational value of a
full program of library services. A grant of $1,130,000 is now being
used to bring selected elementary and secondary schools up to A.L.A.
standards for the same purpose recommended in the report of 1920.

In 1920, the National Education Association of Secondary Educa-
tion recommended a six-point program for school libraries:

1. Appropriate housing and equipment of the library; 2. Profes-
sionally trained librarians; 3. Scientific selection of books
and other materials, and proper classification and cataloging
of this material; 4. Instruction on use of books and libraries;
5. Adequate annual appropriation for salaries and for mainte-
nance of the library, for the purchase of books and other
printed matter, for the rebinding of books, for supplies, and
for general upkeep; 6. A trained librarian as a state supervisor
to be appointed a member of the state education department . . .
or under the library commission in co-operation with the state
department . . . .[3]

One authority reported marked improvement in school library pro-
grams and in the number of school libraries following the publication of

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 693-694.

[2]American Association of School Librarians, News from the Knapp
School Libraries Project (Illinois: 1963).

[3]National Education Association, Committee on Library Organiza-
tion and Equipment, Standard Library Organization and Equipment for
Secondary Schools of Different Sizes (Albany: University of the State
of New York, 1920), p. 10.

the Certain Report. Standards have been raised and state departments of
education have revised their standards, usually in line with those of
the regional accrediting agencies.[1]

> The standards and their 1932 supplement, were also officially
> adopted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Second-
> ary Schools. They had a great deal of influence on the develop-
> ment of school libraries and helped amazingly in raising the
> level of support, organization, and service.[2]

## Part II

### The Search for Quantitative Norms for Evaluating
### School Libraries

Early standards were usually firm, numerical stipulations which
afforded schools tangible, specific goals for staffing and equipping
their libraries. This was what educators wanted and it provided admin-
istrators with factual data for securing the necessary funds for mate-
rials, facilities, and staff to serve the students and teachers of their
schools.

Following the adoption of the Certain Standards, quantitative
norms for secondary school libraries were adopted by regional accrediting
associations and state education departments. The standards were easier
to enforce when stated in numerical terms but the rigidity fostered grow-
ing dissatisfaction, and eventually resulted in a comprehensive investi-
gation of the problems of accrediting.

In 1933, the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards was
organized to study the school, as a whole, in terms of quality rather
than quantity. Over a quarter of a million dollars were spent during

---

[1] Mildred L. Mickel, "Standards and Certification," Library
Trends, I, No. 3 (January, 1953), 347.

[2] Ibid., p. 346.

years of economic depression to replace the detailed specifications with descriptive statements. It was thought then, as today, that the library could not be treated as a separate part of the whole school, but that its activities should be integrated with all phases of the school's organization and activities. The Evaluative Criteria[1] became a tool of self-evaluation providing a periodic record of progress to be reviewed by a visiting committee of experienced and professional educators.

Although Hayes found the sections devoted to library materials were an improvement over similar sections in former standards, she questioned the methods used to determine the adequacy of the collection. For example, each periodical owned by the library was rated by a fixed quality score which represented the judgment of a large group of secondary school librarians, and the score did not allow for circumstances germane to the individual school, and afforded no valid interpretation of the general worth of the periodical collection.[2]

Changes in the instruments and procedures for evaluation of the school library have corresponded closely with changes in educational measurement and evaluation.[3]

By 1945, there was a recognized need for a quantitative measuring stick, combined with qualitative statements about the educational functions of the library. The American Library Association's Committee on Post-War Planning published School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow[4]

[1]Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards: Evaluative Criteria. Section P, Library Services. (1940 ed.; Washington, D.C.: The Study, 1939), 238 pp., pp. 207-218.

[2]Margaret Hayes, "Evaluating School Library Services," Library Trends, I (January, 1953), 372-385.

[3]Ibid., p. 372.

[4]American Library Association, Committee on Post-War Planning, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow: Functions and Standards, Planning for Libraries No. 5 (Chicago: The Association, 1945), 43 pp.

which devoted entire chapters to general topics of service, personnel, resources, housing and administration. The contents represented the judgments of school library specialists.

The higher quantitative standards were used to stimulate increased support for the library, while the qualitative requirements outlined succinctly the purposes, types and characteristics of library services necessary for a vital educational program.

Following two and one-half years of research, a revised edition of the Evaluative Criteria[1] was published. The major usefulness of the newer edition lay in its listing of the basic services and facilities essential to a good high school library program and its emphasis upon appraisal on the basis of student needs. Its lack of suggestions as to the types of evidence needed to get a complete picture of current services, and methods for determining the success of the library program in terms of student needs constituted its chief limitations.

Rufsvold[2] believed that standards were important instruments in library evaluation even though their application might not permit a thorough appraisal of the status of the library in question.

Since effective library service was dependent upon adequate resources, sound organization, and a capable staff, devices for measuring these aspects of the library were felt to be essential. The need for more precise measures of the educational functions of the school library

---

[1] "Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," Evaluative Criteria, (1950 ed.; Washington, D.C.: The Study, 1950), 305 p.

[2] Margaret I. Rufsvold, "Library Service to Schools in the South since 1900" (unpublished Master's Thesis, 1933), 128 p., The Abstract.

was recognized in Henne's[1] four-point program for the total evaluation of any school library: (1) obtaining information concerning basic factors which described the school and which affected the evaluation of the school library; (2) measuring the library in terms of existing standards relative to budget, staff, materials collection, equipment and library use; (3) appraising the library's participation in the achievement of the school's objectives; and (4) keeping the essential records necessary for a valid evaluation. The chief value of the proposed program was that it was intended to serve as a guide for the librarian interested in establishing his own procedures which would go beyond the mere application and interpretation of standards. It was not intended as a universally-appropriate instrument.

A Planning Guide for the High School Library Program, designed by Henne, Ersted, and Lohrer,[2] was based in large part upon the suggestions made earlier by Henne. The end product of evaluation—planning a future program for improved school library service—was emphasized. Standards of the regional accrediting associations, and the national professional association of school librarians, were included for aspects of the library program for which standards existed. Evaluations of the relative importance to the school of the services or facilities, and their effectiveness or adequacy were recorded by encircling appropriate symbols in the margin. These were later transferred to summary tables. The analysis was thorough, and a significant part of the appraisal

---

[1] Frances Henne, "The Evaluation of the School Libraries," in National Society for Study of Education: Forty-second Yearbook, Part II, The Library on General Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943), pp. 333-349.

[2] Frances Henne, et al., A Planning Guide for the High School Library Program (Chicago: American Library Association, 1951), 140 p.

consisted of the identification of reasons for not achieving the objectives desired.

Recognition of the value of an informed faculty, and of student and community participation in planning the educational program led the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program,[1] in 1949, to organize the Local Area Consensus Studies. These consisted of inventories which sought cooperation and support by asking: What do you think about our school library program,[2] and In what respects should we strengthen our School Library Program?[3]

> Standards for school library service have been formulated for one major purpose--to meet the needs of the pupils and teachers of the school of which it is a part. It is commonly agreed that they should be used to stimulate improvement and should represent ideals to be attained, not ends in themselves.[4]

> The application of standards, or the measurement of the school against standards, should be a continuous process interpreted as a part of the general educational program of the school.[5]

---

[1]H. C. Hand, _Prospectus of the Local Area Consensus Studies_ (Circular Series A, No. 51, Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program Bulletin No. 15, Springfield, Illinois.) Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, March, 1951.

[2]Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program, _What Do You Think About Our School Library Program?_ (Consensus Study No. 6, Inventory A.) (Springfield, Illinois: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1951.)

[3]Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program, _In What Respects Should We Strengthen Our School Library Program?_ (Consensus Study No. 6, Inventory B.) (Springfield, Illinois: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1951.)

[4]Mildred L. Nickel, _op. cit._, p. 345.

[5]_Ibid._

Part III

The Progress of Ohio's Secondary School Standards
as They Pertain to the Library Program

Section A--The Influence of Surveys of School and Public Libraries

Ohio has produced a limited amount of research on school librar-

ies which has contributed to the general betterment of library services.

Aldrich[1] mentioned the periodic concern for a better understand-

ing of all factors of the school library problem, and he reported a

statewide interest in educational advancement with specific emphasis on

the status of school libraries.

> National leadership has frequently sponsored general library
> development through investigations and reports on school
> library status and needs, teacher and librarian training and
> certification, national and state participation in school
> library service, evaluations, and emphasis of the school
> library as an integral part of the total educational program.
> Statewide surveys of Ohio education in 1913 and 1946 are
> used because they reveal school library conditions and sug-
> gest ways to improve the quality of library service. One of
> the twenty-five volumes of the Cleveland Education Survey of
> 1916 analyzes school library problems and offers proposals
> for school library improvement.
> Annual and biennial reports of Ohio's chief state school
> officer and other publications of the state department of
> education not only contain much information on education in
> general, but statistical data on schools and school libraries
> and pertinent information on school library legislation.[2]

In 1945, the Ohio Legislature created a Library Survey Commission

to study the laws affecting the organization, administration and financing

of library services. Library laws needed revision, and the matter

---

[1] Frederic Delong Aldrich, "History of Ohio Public School Library
Legislation" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Division of Education,
Western Reserve University, 1953, 209 p.), p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

bothered many educators, particularly the librarians.

> Not only are the public schools users of library service, but in
> Ohio they influence library service in general by virtue of the
> power of boards of education to create public library districts
> and to appoint library trustees.[1]

A conference was called to consider a three-point program:

(1) organization and control of library service in Ohio; (2) control and
administration of school libraries; (3) financing of school library
service.

> The Ordinance of 1787 creating the northwest territory declared
> that schools and the means of education shall forever be en-
> couraged. Libraries are a means of education. The problems
> confronting the provision of library service to schools and
> adults need careful consideration if adequate solutions are to
> be reached. The need for mutual understanding between school
> men and librarians has been felt for some time and the creation
> of a Library Survey Commission by the Governor and the legisla-
> ture suggested that now was the time for a workshop on library
> problems.[2]

Fifty educators, librarians and library trustees were invited to
participate. Members of the Joint Committee of the Ohio Education Asso-
ciation and Ohio Library Trustees Association, the Committee on Libraries
of the Ohio Post-War Program Commission, the Director of Studies of the
Library Survey Commission, staff members from the State Department of
Education, and others who were selected to provide geographical represen-
tation of all sections of the state, comprised the group.

The Ohio cooperative study was significant because it undoubtedly
precipitated the revision of the Ohio High School Standards (1947) which
placed considerable emphasis upon the library. It was not unrelated to
current efforts to meet the challenge of library service to students.

---

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, School-Library Workshop:
A Report of the Conference on School and Library Relationships, Columbus,
Ohio was published by the Ohio State Library, Columbus, Ohio, 1946. p. 8.

[2]Ibid., p. 4.

It would be interesting to note the changes Ohio would adopt if a state-wide study of school-public library relationship should be attempted.

The Library Survey Commission recommended six principles of school library service, namely:

(1) Responsibility of boards of education for the financing of school library service, or help in securing for the public library giving the service, support equal to a basic support for general library service plus support equal to a basic support for school library service.

(2) One library unit for smaller communities should serve general and school library needs, housed when practicable in school buildings.

(3) Responsibilities for shared payment of salaries; purchase of materials and equipment should be defined clearly in a contract.

(4) Accessible quarters of ample size located on the ground floor with separate outside entrance open at least two evenings a week and all vacation periods except legal holidays with provision by the board of education for adequate light, heat and maintenance during all hours the library is open.

(5) Cooperation between school and public library personnel.

(6) Sufficiently large units to provide central services and trained personnel.[1]

Six points strike at organizational and administrative problems which must be solved by the state before librarians might qualify for a state financial subsidy: (1) greater uniformity in the nature and power of the boards of trustees, (2) units of economical size, (3) definition of defensible adequate minimum for support and establishment of some reasonable level of required local effort, (4) provision for financial assistance for mergers of existing small-library districts, (5) broadened authority of boards of library trustees to permit contracts for library service across county lines, (6) adoption of operating levies for library support by a majority vote.

Constructive planning in Ohio for practical library quarters, larger service units, and cooperation between school and public library

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

personnel have made, and continue to make, a contribution to library practice recommended by the American Library Association.

Although it may be assumed that current practices and unmet needs have tended to influence standards in every generation, each era offered developmental changes which supported and strengthened earlier convictions, or provided adequate reasons to disregard them.

In 1945, the Study highlighted the broad functions of the school library and suggested better ways of sharing the publicly-owned library facilities and services. The influence of this conference may be observed by reviewing the main issues of the Ohio High School Standards, 1947, which were prepared to guide, to teach, and to inspire librarians as well as school administrators. Although certain quantitative standards were observed, the recommendations permitted great flexibility in interpretation.

An example of the simple, qualitative aspect of these standards should be cited. For example, the number of books required for adequate library service was difficult to evaluate, and the 1947 standards defined the complex problem and expressed the critical term as follows:

> Adequacy must be considered in terms of needs and interests of pupils and teachers, abilities of pupils, requirements of curriculum, methods of instruction and the availability of services outside of the school.[1]

Concerning purchase of expensive sets of reference books there was the recommendation that reference books

> should be selected from those approved and recommended by the A.L.A. and the H. W. Wilson Catalog. It is also advisable to

---

[1]Ohio High School Standards,1947, revised by R. M. Garrison, issued by Clyde Hissong, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Thomas J. Herbert, Governor of Ohio. 111 p. P. 58.

consult a library which subscribes to the "Subscription Books Bulletin" published by the A.L.A. The collection of books must represent the very best which can be purchased with the available funds.[1]

The 1947 standards identified the functions of the library as follows:

(1) To enrich and vitalize the curriculum and to supply needed reference material.
(2) To provide for the vocational interests of pupils and teachers.
(3) To encourage the acquisition of independent habits of study.
(4) To offer valuable exploratory experiences.
(5) To train pupils in the effective use of the library.[2]

The standards also specified systematic instruction in the effective use of the library, and recommended a series of lessons to teach pupils the system and method of filing and cataloging as well as how to use reference material.

Advanced education of the library was encouraged: "The quality of the service the librarian can render is proportional to her training for the work."[3]

The standards positively recommended adequate personnel and suggested ways to free the librarian so that she could give the best service. It was unfortunate that these carefully-prepared standards overlooked the great need for paid adult clerical assistants who could handle the technical, clerical details, and probably direct library publicity.

The 1947 standards stressed contacts and contracts with public libraries, and with the State Library, as a method of providing better

[1]Ibid., p. 59.

[2]Ibid., p. 62.

[3]Ibid.

service.

When libraries were small and had access to the services of larger libraries, it was normal to seek substantial forms of assistance in an effort to accomplish the goals of service. The 1947 standards[1] proposed the cooperative plan of establishing a public library in the school building. Borrowing from the county library was also recommended. The standards also recognized a problem which parallels today's pressure to keep up with the reading needs of youth.

When the public library was more removed, the school should have had sufficient general reference material for use in school, and should have depended on the public library for free reading and advanced or special materials. It should be recognized that it was difficult, as now, for the average small library to purchase, without financial assistance, all of the collateral reading material needed by high school pupils. Some plan for pooling of all of the resources, and to foster friendly relationship between the school and other library agencies was obviously needed.

It seemed obvious that this recommendation merited further study by public librarians, schoolmen, and the taxpaying citizenry.

Within a year of the publication of the 1947 Ohio High School Standards, Nolan and Herrick[2] reported the findings of a statewide analysis of the 1948 annual reports submitted to the State Department of Education by Ohio's high school principals. The study was made in preparation for a conference on school library problems jointly sponsored by the State Department of Education, the Ohio Library Association, and the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 64.

[2] Nolan and Herrick, op. cit., pp. 220-221.

Ohio Education Association. The conference was attended by superintendents of schools and school librarians from all parts of Ohio.

At the time, the general picture of school libraries was one of great unevenness, both with respect to quality and quantity of services. Larger schools appeared to enjoy the advantage of trained personnel, and often the resources of a public library, while smaller schools, for the most part, had relatively few books, and classroom teachers attempted to give whatever library service existed. Outside of the small school there was little evidence of public library service.

The conclusions of the conference recognized that educational opportunities in any field were not equal in all parts of the state and that every child should be given a chance to acquire good reading habits and a liking for reading while in school.

The actual gains from the conference are not estimable, but the report suggested two definite ways to improve services: (1) it was felt to be imperative that superintendents and principals undertake systematically to improve the quality of their school libraries; and (2) that qualified school library supervision be provided at the state level, or otherwise.

The report of the Conference on School Library Problems held in January, 1949, tended to show Ohio in a less favorable position than the 1947 standards would indicate. It may therefore be concluded that the 1947 Ohio Standards were designed to establish and organize libraries where they did not exist, as well as to upgrade services in schools that had libraries.

Table 2.1 summarizes the status of Ohio school libraries, together

with A.L.A. recommendations[1] based upon statistics gathered from 1,210 schools by the Conference. Of these schools, 998 had enrollments under 500 and this group seemed to lack organization, proper facilities, regular library staff, and any measurable means of support. No figures on expenditures for books were reported for schools in this group. Only a few schools had a librarian on duty more than one or two periods a day.

It may be observed that some of the larger schools, even those in the 500-999 enrollment category, had more books than A.L.A. standards required, but that no school in any category met the A.L.A. minimum expenditure recommendation of $1.50 per pupil. Half of the schools in the 1,000-1,999 group had smaller book collections than were recommended. The largest schools reported at least one librarian who had had more than 15 semester hours of training in library science. No clerical assistants were reported, although it was a known fact that clerks were employed in Cleveland at that time. It is very likely that the questionnaire did not ask specifically for data on clerical assistance.

A progress report on library expenditures and the training of librarians was released in 1955. It was compiled from statistical records on Ohio school libraries for the year 1952-1953.[2] At that time, all high schools of the state had school libraries. Fifty-four per cent of the high school librarians, however, had no specialized library training; 61 per cent had less than six semester hours of library work.

---

[1]American Library Association, Committee on Post-War Planning, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, op. cit.

[2]Report of the Ohio School Survey Committee to the Governor and the General Assembly, Ohio School Survey Committee (Ohio, 1955), p. 23.

TABLE 2.1

STATUS OF OHIO SCHOOL LIBRARIES, 1948

| Enrollment | No. of Schools | Seating Space | | No. of Volumes | | Book Budget | | Personnel FTE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ALA | Ohio | ALA | Ohio | ALA | Ohio | ALA | Ohio |
| 2,000 and Over | 8 | 10% | 100% Inade-quate | 10,000 | Adequate | $1.50 per pupil | 100% below standards | 4.0 librarians 2.0 clerks | Well-paid librarians |
| 1,000-1,999 | 60 of 71 reports analyzed. All but one in city school districts | 10% | Over 50% Inade-quate | 7,000-10,000 | 4,000-16,000 50% meet stand-ards | $1.50 per pupil | 100% below standards $ .23-$1.26 | 2.0-4.0 librar-ians 1.0 clerk | 1.0 librarians greatest per-centage have 15 hrs. library science |
| 500-999 | 101 of 133 re-ports ana-lyzed | 10% 75-100 | 25% meet stand-ards | 5,000-7,000 | 1,600-9,000 33% meet standards | $1.50 per pupil | 100% below standards $ .22-$1.32 | 1.0 librarian 1.0 clerk | 60% have more than 15 hrs. library science; 8% have no spe-cial training |
| 0-499 | 998 | 15% | 25% meet stand-ards | 10 per pupil | No report | $1.50 per pupil | No report | 1.0 librarian part-time clerk 200 students | Few give full-time service. Untrained li-brarians one or two periods per day. |

Source of Data: File of reports for 1,210 public high schools submitted by the principals in October, 1948, was analyzed by the Research Committee of the Ohio Association of School Librarians. These reports were summarized by Isabel Nolan and John H. Herrick in "What Is the Status of Library Service in Ohio Schools?" Ohio Schools (May, 1949), pp. 220-221.

Eleven per cent of the schools spent no money for library books in 1952-
1953, and 13 per cent afforded no money for periodicals. The median ex-
penditure per pupil was $1.33 for books and $.22 for periodicals. Only
one school in seven exceeded $2.99 per pupil for books and $.49 per
pupil for periodicals.

According to the figures, book collections in many schools had im-
proved since 1949, but the fact that so many spent nothing for books or
added no periodicals indicated serious lacks. Moreover, there was a
great difference between the top figure of $2.99 per pupil spent for
books in 1952, and the $6.00-$12.00 per pupil which was being spent in
1964 by some of the schools in Cuyahoga County.

The Ohio High School Standards for 1957 adopted the terminology of
a modern library in Standard VIII, Instructional Materials. This ap-
peared to be a reinforcement of the recognized need for better materials
and services. It immediately precedes the section on The Library Collec-
tion, Standard IX.

> Instructional materials shall be appropriate in kind and amount
> to make possible the achievement of the purposes of the educa-
> tional program.
> A.  Instructional materials shall meet the needs in all areas
>     of work in the educational program offered by the school.
> B.  Each school shall have sufficient textbook materials and
>     the proper procedure for their selection, filing, and
>     preservation.
> C.  Each school shall have audio-visual instructional materials.
> D.  Each school shall make effective use of current literature
>     and newspapers.
> E.  The board of education or administrative authority of each
>     school system shall provide necessary physical facilities
>     and appropriate instructional materials for each department.[1]

The function of the library is outlined as follows:

---

[1] Ohio High School Standards (Minimum) 1957, The State of Ohio,
State Board of Education, Columbus (Effective--January 1, 1958), 116 p.
p. 13.

The library shall be the service center and unifying agency in:
1. Promoting the philosophy of the school.
2. Enriching and vitalizing the curriculum.
3. Providing for vocational and avocational interests of pupils and teachers.
4. Developing independent habits of study.
5. Encouraging exploratory experiences.
6. The use of library and visual materials effectively and efficiently.[1]

The advent of the "instructional materials" concept has had a noticeably great impact upon the current, national standards.

A reliable tool for library evaluation was revised in 1960 to include instructional materials handled by the school library, namely, the Evaluative Criteria.[2] Schedule F is especially notable for its presentation of a service based upon a rapidly-increasing range and quantity of materials, and new forms of communication materials.

The Evaluative Criteria of 1960 presented a problem when evaluators and staff attempted to interpret the effectiveness of a program based upon two separate services: the library proper, and the materials service. Often the separation was the result of a building which would demand major structural changes were the two services to be housed together. The 1960 Edition afforded criteria for better coordination of the over-all program, more efficient use of personnel, and better insight into unnecessary duplication of effort which might be reduced. A major improvement over the 1950 Edition was the concept of the materials instruction center and the analysis of the book collection and the periodicals. Moreover, from the point of view of the librarian analyzing her own collection, the record keeping was simpler and at least equally

---

[1] Ibid., p. 40.

[2] National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition. The Author, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 1960. 376 p.

effective as the former edition where a count of the number of A.L.A. and H. W. Wilson titles was indicated.

To provide staff, quarters, and equipment was not enough if understanding and enthusiasm to improve education by giving a better program of library service to teachers and students were lacking.

It is very difficult to include everything, however. One librarian noted the omission in the physical facilities section where there is no mention of electrical outlets. Microcard readers, viewers, or recording machines can be used on any table top in a reading room, but lack of nearby electrical outlets can prevent their use.

## Section B--Ohio's Approach to A.L.A.'s Standards for School Library Programs, 1960

Reviewing the progress of school libraries during the past half century demonstrates not only the value of determining goals but of defining a program to reach them. Recognition of the growing opportunities of school libraries to promote independent study, to stimulate the creative teacher, to challenge zealous students and to encourage slower learners through the expanded facilities of the instructional materials center, constitutes a major breakthrough in education as well as in library services.

Acknowledgment of the need for specially-trained library personnel, and the projected ideas for use of college-trained technicians as assistants to the head librarian, in lieu of additional staff with the library science degree, and the recognition that clerical personnel are

as indispensable as librarians for certain functions are signs that real progress is promised by the immediate future.

The most comprehensive and useful guide to help in appraising a library program and in planning for improvement was published by the American Library Association in 1960. Standards for School Library Programs[1] is gaining wide acceptance partially because its recommendations are practical and afford latitude to compensate for different aspects of library development, but more significantly, because of the broad participation in the research and preparation of the standards. A committee of the American Association of School Librarians, a division of A.L.A., sought the cooperation of twenty national professional and lay organizations interested in quality education. Nine of the twenty participating organizations were affiliated with the N.E.A.

The new standards pointed out that a good school library was a readily-accessible, centrally-organized collection of many kinds of related materials that may be used to enrich and support the school's educational program. The professionally-trained librarian was said to bring the program alive for teachers and students, make it an integral part of the curriculum, motivate learning, and guide the development of tastes in reading, listening and viewing.

According to the A.L.A. report of 1945, the final goals of libraries consisted of a program of services fulfilling the purposes of the library. These were to:

1. Participate effectively in the school program as it strives to meet the needs of pupils, teachers, parents, and other

---

[1]American Library Association, American Association of School Librarians, Standards for School Library Programs (Chicago: A.L.A., 1960), 132 p.

community members.

2. Provide boys and girls with the library materials and services most appropriate and most meaningful in their growth and development as individuals.

3. Stimulate and guide pupils in all phases of their reading so that they may find increasing enjoyment and satisfaction and may grow in critical judgment and appreciation.

4. Provide an opportunity through library experiences for boys and girls to develop helpful interests, to make satisfactory personal adjustments, and to acquire desirable social attitudes.

5. Help children and young people to become skillful and discriminating users of libraries and of printed and audio-visual materials.

6. Introduce pupils to community libraries as early as possible and co-operate with those libraries in their efforts to encourage continuing education and cultural growth.

7. Work with teachers in the selection and use of all types of library materials which contribute to the teaching program.

8. Participate with teachers and administrators in programs for continuing professional and cultural growth of the school staff.

9. Co-operate with other librarians and community leaders in planning and developing an over-all library program for the community or area.[1]

The above goals defined by the A.L.A. Committee on Post-War Planning may be achieved most effectively by close adherence to the current Standards for School Library Programs.[2] They were considered to be very important to administrators planning a school library, and for achieving and maintaining the modern, quantitative and qualitative requirements for materials, facilities, personnel and, ultimately, services.

Public interest, inquiry, study and evaluation of libraries in Ohio have contributed to the changes wrought in recommendations of the state. It is encouraging, for example, to sense the high degree of flexibility written into Ohio's most recent publication on the subject,

---

[1]American Library Association, Committee on Post-War Planning, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

[2]Standards for School Library Programs, 1960, op. cit.

A Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries,[1] prepared by a state-wide committee composed of Department of Education personnel, administrators, librarians, and the officers of the Ohio Association of School Librarians in an effort to assist boards of education and school administrators in their efforts to improve library services.  It is an instrument which can be used to assess the present level of library service in any school, and it affords an excellent statement of the philosophy and purposes of the modern school library.

> Today education is essential for all.  Our schools must have functional programs with libraries which provide the necessary resources for teaching and learning.[2]

The American Library Association Standards for School Library Programs, 1960, was studied by the committee; hence their report reflects the "most desirable," current A.L.A. standards.

This Ohio guide should encourage schools, which fall below the accepted national standards, to improve the quality of their services.  By following the suggested two-step program which is readily adaptable to fit the local circumstances of a school, definite progress should be quickly achieved.

To complete the growth-profile of Ohio school libraries and to clarify further its progress in terms of the standards, three tables are employed to present a factual summary of Ohio standards from 1947 to 1963.  The North Central Association requirements for the 1963-1964 school year, and the A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs, 1960,

---

[1]E. E. Holt, Superintendent of Public Instruction, A Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries, State of Ohio, Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, 269M4 with Bibliography Guidelines for State School Library Standards.  Revised, February, 1962.  24 p.

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

serve as controls for judging the dimensions of the goals set by Ohio.

Table 2.2 deals with the quantitative aspects of book collections, Table 2.3 relates to the financial needs for books and audiovisual materials, and Table 2.4 concerns personnel and training.

Table 2.2 shows the number of volumes as well as the number of titles needed to meet the requirements for a secondary school library. They are expressed in terms of enrollment as recommended in the Ohio High School Standards (Minimum) for 1947, and are contrasted with the Ohio standards for 1957. The latter include recommendations for enrollment below 200, although no recommendation was made for this group in 1947. Recognition of the needs of libraries in very small schools is also significant.

Similar improvement occurred in the Ohio standards in four other enrollment groups: (1) in schools with 200-499 pupils, 2,000 volumes were recommended in 1947, but 5,000 was the minimum in 1957; (2) enrollments of 500-999 pupils were thought to need at least 5,000 volumes in 1947, but by 1957 this was raised to 7,000; (3) for larger schools with 1,000-1,999 pupils, the number of volumes recommended rose from 7,000 in 1947, to 10,000 in 1957. The increase was proportionately the same for schools with enrollments of 200-499, thereby restating the inference that smaller schools also required adequate, basic book collections; (4) in the highest enrollment group of 2,000 or more pupils there appeared the first sign of compromise. In 1947 the recommendation for the largest Ohio high schools was 10,000-15,000 volumes, including 6,000-8,000 titles. Ten years later the minimum figures were increased but the single recommendation of 12,000 volumes included 7,000 titles, lower than the maximum recommended ten years earlier.

TABLE 2.2

NUMBER OF LIBRARY BOOKS IN RELATION TO ENROLLMENT[a]

| Enrollment | Ohio High School Minimum Standards | | | | A Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries 1962-1963 | | North Central Criterion V 1963-1964 | ALA Standards for School Library Programs, 1960 | |
| | 1947 | | 1957 | | | | | Teachers | Students |
| | Titles | Volumes | Titles | Volumes | Titles | Volumes | | Titles | Volumes |
| 5,000<br>3,000<br>2,000 | 8,000<br>7,000<br>6,000 | 15,000<br>12,000<br>10,000 | | | | | | | |
| 2,000 and over | 8,000 | 15,000 | 7,000 | 12,000 | 7,000 | 10,000 3 more per pupil over 2,000 | 3 more books per pupil over 2,000 | 200-1,000 | 10 per pupil |
| 1,000-1,999 | 5,000 | 7,000 | | | 6,000 | 7,000 3 more per pupil over 1,000 | 4 more books per pupil for 500-2,000 enrolled | 200-1,000 | 10 per pupil |
| 500-999 | 3,500 | 5,000 | | | 5,000 | 5,000 4 more per pupil over 500 | 1,200 books exclusive of high school textbooks, appropriate for institutional needs of pupils or at least 7 books per pupil enrolled, whichever is larger | 200-1,000 | 6,000-10,000 |
| 200-499 | 1,700 | 2,000 | 3,500 | 5,000 | 3,500 | 2,000--10 more per pupil over 200 | | 200-1,000 | 6,000 |
| 0-100 | No Recommendation | | 1,700 | 2,000 | 1,700 | 2,000 | | 200-1,000 | 6,000 |

[a]American Association of School Librarians, Standards for School Library Programs, 1960 is regarded as the best current guide for school libraries.

TABLE 2.3

SCHOOL LIBRARY BOOK AND AUDIO-VISUAL BUDGETS IN RELATION TO ENROLLMENT

| Enrollment | Ohio High School Standards (Minimum) State of Ohio, State Board of Education Effective January 1, 1958 | | A Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries (Desirable Standards) 1962-1963 | North Central Criterion V 1963-1964 | AIA Standards for School Library Programs 1960 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 1947 | 1957 | | | |
| 199 or less | Min. $100 $1.00 per pupil | $200ᵃ | $300 Min. $750 Min. | $2.50 per pupil for first 200 pupils. Not less than $400 annually | Minimum $1,000 |
| 200-499 | $1.00 per pupil | $1.00 per pupilᵃ | $300 for first 200 pupils $1.50 for each additional or $750 for first 200 $3.00 for each additional | $1.50 per pupil for the next 300 pupils | 200-249 pupils $1,000-$1,500 for books; $4-$6 per student; audio-visual $2-$6 per student |
| 500-999 | $.75 per pupil | $.75 per pupilᵃ | $750 for first 500 pupils $1.00 for each additional or $1,650 for first 500 pupils; $2.50 for each additional | $.75 per pupil for each pupil above 500 enrolled | Books, $4-$6 per student; Audio-visual, $2-$6 per student |
| 1,000 and over | $.75 per pupil The above figures include periodicals, binding materials and supplies | $.50 per pupilᵃ | $1,250 for first 1,000 pupils; $.75 for each additional or $2,650 for first 1,000 pupils; $2.00 for each additional | NCA also requires adequate classroom instructional materials and equipment; reference books, periodicals, newspapers, pamphlets, information files, audio-visual materials, and other learning aids | Books, $4-$6 per student; Audio-visual $2-$6 per student |

ᵃPlus additional funds for: reference books, newspapers and pamphlets, magazine supplies, rebinding; $200-$800 for professional material; and salaries for library personnel to meet the needs of the school.

TABLE 2.4

PERSONNEL AND TRAINING

| Enroll-ment | Ohio High School Standards | | | | A Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries (Desirable Standards) 1962-1963 | North Central Criterion V 1963-1964 | ALA Standards for School Library Programs 1960 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1947 | | 1957 | | | | |
| | Training | FTE | FTE | Training | | | |
| Under 200 | 8 Sem. hrs. Lib. Sci. | FTE not given for Librarian | 1 period per day | 6 Sem. hrs. Lib. Sci. | | 1/3 librarian | |
| 200-299 | 15 Sem. hrs. Lib. Sci. | Librarian .5 | Librarian .5 | 15 Sem. hrs. | .5 librarian 1 additional period each day for administration and planning responsibilities | 200-499 pupils .5 trained librarian | 1.0 librarian .5 adult clerk (Recommended for good school with 200) |
| 300-499 | | for 250-800 Enrollment | | | 1.0 librarian | | 1.0 librarian 1.0 adult clerk |
| 500-799 | | | | | 1.0 librarian .5 adult clerk | 500 or more 1.0 trained librarian | 2.0 librarian 1.0 clerk 1.0 AV coordinator .5 AV clerk |
| 800-1,199 | 30 Sem. hrs. Lib. Sci. | Librarian 1.0 | Librarian 1.0 | 24 Sem. hrs. | 1.0 librarian 1.0 adult clerk | 1.0 trained librarian | 3.0 librarian, 3.0 clerk, 1 AV coordinator, 1.0 for each 600 1 AV clerk, 1.0 for each 1,200 |
| 1,200-1,499 | Larger high schools should have 1.0 or more trained assistants | | | | 2.0 librarians 1.0 adult clerk | | 3.0 librarians + 1.0 for each additional 400 AV coordinator 1 for each 600 AV clerk 1 for each 1,200 |

Table 2.2 further illustrates the continued acceptance of the 1957 standards for Ohio, in the column headed "Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries." Data were abstracted from a document prepared to serve as a guide for the continued development of high school libraries. Although figures support the recommendations for 1957, the qualifying statement, "ALA Standards Most Desirable," was intended to encourage all high schools to foster a library program to meet the A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs.

North Central Criterion V[1] stipulated a minimum of 1,200 books for any high school, or seven books per pupil, whichever is higher. For 500 pupils, the North Central Association recommended 3,500 volumes. This was less than is currently recommended by the Ohio State Department of Education, and is far below the national standards.

For enrollment of 500-1,999, North Central Association reduced the per-capita recommendation from seven to five additional books, and for 2,000 pupils or more it recommended only three books. This exceeded Ohio's recommendation, but did not approach the national standards which call for a minimum of ten books per student.

Although there has been no recent study published on Ohio second-are libraries, some information is available by simple deduction: (1) book collections are below 6,000 volumes in schools with enrollment of 1,000 or less, and more severely lacking in schools with less than 500 students; (2) there is no evidence that Ohio recognized the need for 200-1,000 professional books for teachers' use, with the exception of the recent general statement that the "A.L.A. Standards are most desirable";

---

[1]The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Policies and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools, Criterion V, 39 p., p. 19.

(3) larger schools with enrollments of 1,000 and more are probably not meeting A.L.A.'s recommendation of ten books per student as a minimum requirement for quality library service.

Table 2.3 illustrates the increasing need for financial support of library services as stipulated in the Ohio High School Standards for 1947 and 1957, by the figures in Ohio Secondary Libraries, in the guide prepared by the State Department of Education, by the requirements of North Central Criterion V, 1963-1964, and by the A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs, 1960.

Ohio has increased its minimum annual library budget for high schools from $100 to $200 between 1947 and 1957, but there was no corresponding improvement for libraries in schools with enrollments over 200. In fact, in 1957, for schools of 1,000 and over there was a decrease of $.25 per pupil in recommended expenditures. This may be explained, however, by the fact that the costs of periodicals, binding materials and supplies were not included in 1957, as they were in 1947.

Another increase in the recommendations of the recent Guide for Secondary Libraries was observed. In effect, this was a statement relative to the costs for printed materials. The guide specified the amount shown in Table 2.3, as "Budget for Books."

> All fine money and gifts should be allocated to the library for the purchase of miscellaneous materials . . . , e.g., pamphlets, leaflets, emergency requests, special publications, etc.[1]

There was no attempt to estimate an equitable budget for audio-visual materials although the guide implied a need for such a provision. There was also a lack of definition of the role of the library in the audio-visual program although the way was pointed out:

---

[1]E. E. Holt, A Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries. Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Ohio, Department of Education, February, 1962, p. 9.

Audio-visual material, if housed in the library, should be cata-
logued and processed according to recognized procedures for pro-
cessing those materials. If these are not a part of the regular
library collection, a list of materials available in the school
would be in the library.[1]

North Central Criterion V required a minimum annual expenditure
of $400 for books and magazines exclusive of textbooks and audio-visual
materials. A total of $2.50 per pupil was to be allowed for the first
200 pupils, and $1.50 for the next 300 pupils. The Guide for Ohio
Secondary Libraries recommended a minimum of $300-$750 for schools with
fewer than 200 pupils, and $1.50-$3.00 for each additional pupil over
200, in schools with enrollments between 200 and 499. For larger schools
of 1,000 and over, North Central Association stipulated $.75 per pupil
for enrollments above 500. Ohio had a more comprehensible and flexible
recommendation of $1,250 or $2,650 for the first 1,000 pupils, and $.75
to $2.00 for each additional pupil in schools of 1,000 and more pupils.
The alternate figures were steps toward meeting A.L.A. Standards for
School Library Programs.

Fortunately, A.L.A. has afforded workable and realistic goals
for establishing and maintaining budgets both for books and for audio-
visual materials. Standards for other printed materials will be dis-
cussed later (Chapter IV) when presenting current statistics on Ohio
secondary libraries.

For many of the smaller, established libraries it would be a
major step upward to meet the $1,000-$1,500 minimum recommended for all
school libraries. New schools should also plan for this minimum. For
an enrollment of 250 and over, A.L.A. suggests at least $4.00-$6.00[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 13.

[2] A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs, op. cit., pp. 83-
84.

per student for printed materials, which allows approximately one book per student to be added to the school library each year, although "libraries in vocational, technical and other schools having specialized curriculums of this nature may need an annual budget larger than that noted . . . ."[1]

Table 2.4 concerns personnel and the kinds of skills and knowledge recognized as vital for performing the professional library function. This table, like the others, was arranged according to enrollment. Full-time equivalence (FTE) has been employed to express staff time available for library service. Therefore, 1.0 equals one person employed full-time for the work described, and .5 equals one person employed half-time.

In 1947, the standards recommended that schools with less than 800 pupils, but over 250, should have .5 FTE librarians with 15 hours of library science training. Eight semester hours of training in library science were recommended for schools under 250, but no specific time was scheduled for library work. It was expected, however, that one person, possibly a teacher, would be in charge and would spend occasional periods during the week performing library duties. This was a fair assumption since the recommendations for 1957 specified one librarian, with six semester hours of library science, to be on duty one period each day.

In 1957, .5 librarians with 15 semester hours of library science was recommended for schools with 200-500 enrollment. In the more recent Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries, at least .5 of a librarian was expected to be on duty in all schools with less than 300 enrolled.

There has been a noticeable effort to add staff and increase

_____

[1]Ibid., p. 84.

professional training since 1947. Since larger schools have consistently employed a librarian, it is probably more meaningful to compare the figures for smaller schools during the 'forties and 'fifties with the A.L.A. Standards of 1960. Although the North Central Association[1] specified teacher-trained librarians with 15 hours of library science, the requirement falls noticeably short of adequate preparation for a key staff member of the school. North Central further stipulated the equivalent of one-third librarian for schools with under 20 pupils; .5 librarian for 200-499; and one full-time librarian for 500 or more enrollment. Schools are advised to have at least one full-time librarian with five years of college and professional education recommended for the school librarian.[2]

Ohio certification now requires 24 semester hours of library science training. In addition to one trained librarian, even very small schools with only 200 enrollment need half-time of an adult clerical assistant, and schools with 300-499 pupils need a full-time clerical assistant in addition to one librarian indicated in the standards.

The concept of clerical assistants in libraries is not new, but school libraries in Ohio have been slow to recognize the potential of added service which paid clerical help would release.

Improvement is more noticeable in larger schools. The 1947 Ohio standards suggested that schools with 800-1,199 pupils have one full-time librarian with 30 semester hours of library science and that schools with 1,500 or more students have one or more trained assistants.

It is difficult to understand why the standards of 1957 remained

---

[1]The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Criterion V, op. cit., p. 18.

[2]A.L.A. Standards, 1960, op. cit., p. 60.

unchanged from 1947, for schools with over 800 enrollment. It was not until the A.L.A. standards specified more adequate staffing of libraries that Ohio took steps toward meeting the goal.

Where Ohio recommends one librarian and one-half adult, clerical assistant, A.L.A. specifies two librarians, one adult clerical assistant, one audio-visual coordinator, and a half-time audio-visual clerk for schools with 500-799 enrollment. This same arrangement is noted for schools with 1,200-1,499 enrollment. Ohio standards call for two librarians and one adult clerical assistant while A.L.A. standards specify three librarians plus one additional librarian for each 400 students or major fraction thereof, plus an audio-visual coordinator for each 600 students, and one audio-visual clerk for each 1,200.

It would appear that Ohio is working its way toward building stronger foundations for excellence in its school libraries, but many schools continue to face a realistic challenge.

## Part IV

### Recent Efforts to Improve Library Services to Students and Teachers

Libraries were notably active in the early nineteen sixties, partially in their divergent efforts to handle the intensive and widespread crowding of their facilities by the expanding student bodies. Discussions and studies have been in progress in many areas and great sums of money were being spent for the purpose of finding better methods of handling the great numbers of students, who seem more highly motivated to read than at any former time.

Librarians recognized the need for national discussions of the current library crises and, in 1963, they arranged for a series of

meetings patterned after the 1960 White House Conference on the aging, and children and youth. The resulting A.L.A. Conference-Within-A-Conference in which librarians from all services met to conduct "An Inquiry into the Needs of Students, Libraries and the Educational Process" was summarized by Lowell Martin.

1. First find out just what is needed by students in your locality and just what is already available.
2. The necessity for communication in clarifying the student demand for reading materials, in decisions on action, and in meeting the need in the period ahead.
3. Definition of the respective functions of the several kinds of libraries in serving students.
4. Development of cooperative joint action cutting across types of libraries.
5. A definite increase in financial support in order to bring all libraries up to standard.
6. All possible legislation and regulations concerning libraries should be reviewed, strengthened, applied to help meet this growing student need.
7. Recruitment of librarians must be intensified.
8. More effective use to be made of library personnel through review of library positions and a search for new personnel plans.
9. Seek to apply technical and mechanical advances more fully in libraries.
10. Fresh approaches must be made to instruction in use of libraries on the part of students.[1]

This conference on the challenge of the libraries to meet the students' needs convened near the date of publication of the first Deiches Report.[2] The Enoch Pratt Free Library, the public library of Baltimore, and neighboring schools had found that it was no longer practical to continue traditional programs of library services; therefore, a thorough study of all facilities and methods was proposed.

---

[1]The Conference-Within-A-Conference, "Lowell Martin's CWC Summary," in A.L.A. Bulletin, LVII, No. 8 (September, 1963), 735-741.

[2]Lowell A. Martin, "Challenge and Opportunity," Students and the Pratt Library, No. 1 in Deiches Fund Studies of Public Library Service, Enoch Pratt Library (Baltimore, Maryland, July, 1963), 68 p., p. 41.

The Deiches Library Fund Trustees provided money for a series of studies aimed to help public librarians improve their services, especially libraries located in metropolitan areas. The Deiches Studies, however, are more than a mere progression of surveys; they also involve experimentation and action to test the findings.

In July, 1963, the first report entitled: "Students and the Pratt Library: Challenge and Opportunity,"[1] was published.

Before the Deiches reports can be evaluated and applied to parallel conditions in other areas, it is desirable to note the development of the situation in Baltimore and to identify the areas of the sources of the problems and the proposed solutions.

The first Baltimore study identified the library service problem succinctly:

> The schools depend on reading as a significant element in education, but adequate provision has not been made for student reading materials either in the schools or the community-at-large. Within the next five years, the situation will move toward a crisis, and unless met in some way will distinctly deter the educational growth of young people and undermine the service programs of libraries.[2]

The problem was not a self-contained challenge to the public library, nor was it exclusively a school predicament; it was an alarming condition which had to be attacked by informed men of action who would proceed to gather and analyze the facts, and plan a program for exploring and testing better ways of handling the confused and complex situation.

The study found an impressive amount of school-related reading being done by a majority of the young people. Concern was derived

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Ibid., p. 41.

especially from the strain experienced by agencies attempting to supply the reading material for students, and the realization that doubling the student demand in the next five years would result in intolerable pressures on both the public library and the school library, as well as frustrations in the educational experiences of the students.

Two aspects which were regarded as vital to learning were (1) the great amount of materials being examined by young people and (2) the quantity of reading which they did.

Two-thirds of the high school students in Baltimore read at least four books per month. One-third read little except their textbooks. Four out of five non-text books came from school or public libraries. In Baltimore, students used 400,000 books per month, or three million per year, and the average student spent eight to nine hours per month in the school library.

It was significant that public librarians and school librarians attempted to coordinate their services in order to meet the overwhelming demands for published materials, and the swelling ranks of adolescents.

One concrete example of the effort to clarify the public library's responsibility to high school students was to be found in the standards for Young Adult Services in the Public Library.[1] The selection of materials and reading guidance, two of the most important areas in working with young adults, were fully treated with stress placed upon the concept that work with young adults was definitely a part of the adult program of the public library and differs only in focus and emphasis. The focus is on the individual, and the emphasis on expert guidance in reading.

---

[1] Public Library Association, Committee on Standards for Work with Young Adults in Public Libraries, *Young Adult Services in the Public Library* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1960), 50 p.

At times, the school librarian does not receive cooperation from the school faculty or administration, nor does the public librarian always have the cooperation and understanding of other members of the public library staff. The six authors of the report, who were specialists in working with young adults in the public library, directed their efforts toward helping create an educated and thoughtful citizenry, and they stressed the importance of having the two institutions work closely together in developing parallel programs or cooperative programs.

The Deiches analysis of students' use of the library indicated that present-day teaching in high school assumed the availability of a substantial collection containing extensive holdings of both books and magazines. Most school libraries could not meet such expectations even if they were doubled in size. The Deiches Study No. 1[1] indicated that a school library, if it were to meet all the reading needs of a high school with a modern curriculum, might well need 75,000 volumes.

Moreover, students tend to prefer the public library over the school library for the following reasons: (1) more adequate collections, (2) more suitable hours of service, (3) fewer restrictions or controls.

The movement toward a library crisis is gaining momentum. More high school students plan to go to college; accelerated and enriched classes are on the increase; and there is a trend in favor of academic performance as the status symbol. The hard core of the program depends upon the substantial development of school libraries in the immediate future. Not only must they strive for greater excellence, but book collections must be strengthened. It is imperative that schools become better prepared to handle the bulk of collateral and reference reading

[1]Deiches, op. cit., p. 51.

needed by the students. Library seating capacity must be increased to a minimum of 10 per cent of the enrollment and schools must establish longer hours.

Major branches of the public library should have a seating capacity for 150 readers since such a community branch is the primary source of free reading for a majority of the students. The trend in library use by advanced students was also indicated in the marked preference for use of the Central Library of Pratt. This was twice as likely to occur if a student was in an above-average, or accelerated class.

Libraries cannot equal the demands under the present mode of operation; therefore, Baltimore has proposed definite lines for development.

The Deiches report outlines a master plan divided into four stages:[1]

    I. Background or preliminary steps to preserve the strength of libraries

        a. Review the place of reading in secondary education.

        b. Provide in paperback form titles used intensively over a considerable period of time.

    II. Getting full return from present resources

        a. Prepare manuals and other media for a program of instruction in use of resources and libraries.

        b. Longer hours of school library service.

        c. Communications between classroom and library.

    III. Expansion to meet student needs

        a. Develop school library facilities.

        b. Identify the role of Pratt Library in providing student reading materials.

---

[1]Deiches, op. cit., p. 41.

c. Provide facilities to handle increasing student load.

IV. Employment of more dynamic methods through experimentation

   a. Establish a new position of Student-Teacher Librarian.

   b. Organize a coordinating council on student reading materials for the Baltimore area.

It would seem that the Deiches report confirmed at least one major principle: that the era of the independent, small library has passed. It is time to formulate a practical plan which allows the joint efforts of the two agencies to do together what neither could do alone.

The first organized effort to implement the 1960 A.L.A. Standards for the betterment of school libraries was the School Library Development Project in 1961 and 1962.[1] Twenty-two states participated in a national project, established by the American Association of School Librarians (A.A.S.L.) to assist state and local groups in implementing the 1960 national standards. A grant of $100,000 to the American Library Association by the Council on Library Resources made it possible. The purpose was to promote the adoption of higher standards for school libraries in each state. The staff of S.L.D.P. provided leadership training for representatives from the fifty states, allocated grant funds for twenty-one special projects in school library developments, distributed a wide variety of printed and audio-visual materials, and offered consultant service to state and local groups.

State school library associations and state departments of

---

[1]Mary Frances Kennon and Leila Ann Doyle, Planning School Library Development, a report of the School Library Development Project, American Association of School Librarians. School Library Development Project—1962, American Association of School Librarians, a Division of the American Library Association, a Department of the National Education Association (Chicago: American Library Association, 1962), p. 89. Note: Hereafter to be known as S.L.D.P.

education, in cooperation with other education and citizen groups,
launched intensive programs to improve their school libraries. Impetus
and help for state action was provided by the A.A.S.L. Standards Commit-
tee and S.L.D.P. At local levels, growing numbers of schools and school
districts worked to establish and extend school library services by such
means as increased appropriations, added library personnel, and the
development of elementary school libraries.

Good school libraries must be built step by step, through care-
ful planning and coordinated effort. Demonstrations of this approach
were provided by twenty-one S.L.D.P. projects conducted in 1961-1962
which were first required to formulate long-range plans for a period of
three to five years. These state projects tested principles[1] found to
be important in planning school library development and which applied to
an individual school and the school district. They included: (1) focus-
ing on the school library program, including improvement of the services
to pupils and teachers; (2) providing good leadership; (3) obtaining
qualified consultants; (4) evaluating present services and resources;
(5) selecting specific goals; (6) setting up priorities and deadlines;
(7) enlisting support for school library development; (8) maintaining
effective communication; and (9) evaluating and revising plans.

All of the S.L.D.P.-grant projects cited the need for effective
communications, the interpretation of their action during 1961-1962, as
well as for their long-range plans. Case studies were made in two grant
project states, Georgia and Arkansas. The Georgia[2] project demonstrated
the development of strong support for improvement of school libraries

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 12-14.

[2] Ibid., p. 16.

through conferences of representatives of important library, education, and citizen groups. The Arkansas project illustrated effective cooperation by the state school library association, the state library agency, and the state department of education with the state organizations of school principals, superintendents, and architects. Demonstrations of good school-library programs were found to be an effective means for interpreting library services.

The procedures in Georgia were related to the present study. Representatives from the two state school library associations joined with the staff of the Library Division, State Department of Education, to plan ways for using the new national standards to improve school library services in Georgia. S.L.D.P. granted funds to make it possible to hold conferences to familiarize educators and citizens with the national standards, to project the school library situation in Georgia against these standards, and to make immediate and long-range plans for improving service throughout the state. Participants recommended action related to finance, facilities, personnel, and materials.[1]

It was agreed that both the Georgia Accrediting Commission and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools should raise their standards of school library expenditures to bring them more in line with the national standards. Recognizing that such action must be a long-term project, and in view of present differences between the standards, it was suggested: (1) that the two agencies raise the required per-pupil expenditures by $.50 each two years until the national standards were reached, beginning with the 1962-1963 school year; (2) that the State Department of Education increase the state's portion of the school

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 18-20.

library matching funds as a step toward helping schools to meet the proposed higher accreditation requirements; (3) that school librarians be reminded of their responsibility to keep records of, and issue periodical reports on, all school library finances; (4) that school librarians, in conference with classroom teachers and curriculum directors, formulate budget requests for presentation to their school administrators during the school year; (5) that the state organizations of principals and superintendents be urged to conduct a study of budget-making, so as to include consideration of school library budget and finance; (6) that all available means be used to publicize the possibilities for using funds provided by the National Defense Education Act for the acquisition of instructional materials in the fields of science, mathematics, modern foreign languages and under certain conditions, guidance; (7) that the Georgia Association of School Administrators and the Georgia School Board Association recommend to local boards of education the reservation of sufficient bond money to provide a basic collection of five books per pupil, plus related instructional materials, in each new school; (8) that state library organizations send resolutions to their congressmen in support of general federal aid to education; (9) that professional organizations undertake a planned program of action to educate the citizens of Georgia to accept responsibility for providing more financial support for school libraries.

The Georgia project emphasized the need to: (1) lay careful plans for interpreting good school library programs in order to create a demand for them; (2) gain acceptance by all citizens of their corporate responsibility for effecting improvements; (3) plan definite and specific action; (4) provide effective means to keep concerned groups informed on

plans and achievements.

One highly significant factor in the Georgia Project was the leadership of the state school library supervisor.

> The school library picture in Georgia documents the conclusion that school libraries have reached a higher level of development, in general and on a state-wide basis, in those states which have state school library supervisory programs.[1,2]

S.L.D.P. encouraged programs tailored to the needs of school libraries in Georgia and each other state. Arkansas and the District of Columbia worked toward promoting a better understanding of school library programs. New programs of state aid established in North Carolina and Pennsylvania pointed the way for other states. West Virginia conducted a state survey of school libraries and obtained grant funds for the establishment of a state school library position to provide consultative service. State aid for school librarians' salaries was the chief goal in North Carolina, and supervisory programs in pilot school districts were established in Arkansas, Iowa, and Montana. Major improvements in library sources have been achieved through improved budgets, personnel, and library quarters.

The Illinois[3] project concentrated on the development of a school library center to serve thirty-two schools in the multi-district area of Champaign, Urbana, and the University of Illinois laboratory school. Centralized processing of instructional materials, loan and distribution of materials and equipment to individual school libraries, studio facilities for radio, television and recording, production of teaching aids, a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17.

[2] A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 30.

[3] S.L.D.P., op. cit., pp. 37-39.

professional library for teachers, and conference and demonstration
classroom areas were considered in this study. The year's project pre-
pared the way for detailed work on the multi-district center.

New Jersey[1] tested the principles of school library development
as a source of ideas for other groups working to improve the preparation
of teachers for the use of library resources. Special programs for pros-
pective teachers in the use of libraries, team teaching, conferences at
the state and local levels to stimulate programs of in-service education
in the use of library resources, and the developing of guides to help in
planning local in-service activities were found to be practical ways of
accelerating library interest of the teachers; the main connecting artery
between the students and the library.

Gains have been noted, needs will persist, and other studies
will lead to further improvements and higher goals, but the S.L.D.P. has
helped in tangible ways to interpret the school library situation.

In Chapter II, reference was made to the $1,130,000 grant awarded
the A.A.S.L.[2] to demonstrate the educational value of a full program of
school library services as examples of the kind of program recommended
in the national standards. Schools are being selected on the basis of
the school's library program, the potential for demonstration and research
in the school, the nature of the school district, and the teacher-prepara-
tion institution, evidence of the potential for maintaining the level of
program made possible by the Knapp Project, and geographic accessibility
for potential teams of observers. The grant will provide funds for the
purchase of books and other library materials to bring the library

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 40-44.

[2] A.A.S.L., Knapp Project, op. cit.

collection up to recommended standards, pay salaries of additional pro-
fessional and clerical personnel required to meet the standards, includ-
ing summer employment, half-time salary for half-time services of the
field worker assigned by the teacher-preparation institution, plus funds
required for clerical assistance and travel, consultant service by the
Project Director and funds for structural changes in the library facility,
if required.

Demonstration projects will be designed for teachers through co-
operative relationship with institutions engaged in teacher education.

## Conclusions

In the Certain Report of 1918, educators have pronounced the
need for stipulated norms or dimensions to guide the development of
school libraries over many years. There was evidence of recognized need
for specific criteria in Ohio shown in the 1947 Standards of the State
Department of Education, by the Nolan Report in 1949, by the improved
state standards for 1957 and the current state guide to implement A.L.A.'s
1960 Standards for School Library Programs.

Influence has been exerted upon the goals of school and public
libraries by the Deiches Studies and the American Association of School
Librarians School Library Development Project.

The Knapp Project provided further impetus for school library
excellence, and will be particularly significant if an Ohio secondary
school should be selected for demonstration.

One overwhelming deterrent to the improvement of library services
is the lack of information on library personnel, the actual conditions
of existing facilities and programs, and indefinite or conflicting concepts
of their functions.

The present study was planned to identify and evaluate the high school library services in Ohio and to offer recommendations for accomplishing ways of meeting the multiple demands upon libraries now and in the immediate future.

# CHAPTER III

## OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN 1956

### Introduction

In Chapter II, evidence concerning establishing and maintaining quality high school libraries was presented in a manner designed to show, chronologically, the improvements in standards as well as the attitude in Ohio with respect to setting and attaining desirable library goals.

The Nolan report of 1949[1] provided an overview of the status of high school libraries and concluded that great unevenness in materials and facilities characterized the libraries of Ohio. It noted that larger quarters were badly needed in more than half of the schools. In the larger schools, the advantages of more liberal budgets and professional personnel were observed, but an evaluation of the quality and kinds of services that were attempted or accomplished was lacking.

It may be assumed that school libraries functioned about as well as conditions permitted, but there was no indication that they attempted to provide more than mere collections of books organized for use and made accessible through central locations within the high school buildings.

It has been previously noted that the first phase of the present study consisted of a questionnaire survey of all of the Ohio high school libraries in 1956. The general scope of the study is summarized in Table 3.1. Superintendents or principals of 1,138 Ohio public high schools

---

[1]Isabel Nolan and John H. Herrick, op. cit., pp. 220-221.

**TABLE 3.1**

SOURCES OF 1956 DATA ON OHIO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES

| Source of Response | NEO[a] | | Other 75 Counties | | Combined | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Form 1 mailed | 247 | 21.7 | 891 | 78.3 | 1,133 | 100.0 |
| No Response | 98 | 14.0 | 601 | 86.0 | 699 | 100.0 |
| Tabulated | 149 | 33.9 | 290 | 66.0 | 439 | 99.9 |
| Counties Surveyed | 13 | 14.9 | 75 | 85.2 | 88 | 100.1 |
| Replied | 13 | 15.3 | 72 | 84.7 | 85 | 100.0 |
| Types of District Surveyed: | | | | | | |
| City | 108 | 33.5 | 214 | 66.5 | 322 | 100.0 |
| Local | 135 | 18.3 | 601 | 81.7 | 736 | 100.0 |
| Exempted Village | 7 | 8.8 | 73 | 91.3 | 80 | 100.1 |
| Replied: | | | | | | |
| City | 86 | 49.9 | 86 | 49.9 | 172 | 99.8 |
| Local | 56 | 24.7 | 171 | 75.3 | 227 | 100.0 |
| Exempted Village | 7 | 18.0 | 32 | 82.1 | 39 | 100.1 |
| Unknown | | | 1 | | 1 | 100.0 |
| Type of Schools Surveyed: | | | | | | |
| JHS | 54 | 47.8 | 59 | 52.2 | 113[b] | 100.0 |
| J-SHS | 193 | 18.8 | 832 | 81.2 | 1,025 | 100.0 |
| Replied: | | | | | | |
| JHS | 43 | 72.9 | 16 | 27.1 | 59 | 100.0 |
| J-SHS | 106 | 27.9 | 274 | 72.1 | 330 | 100.0 |

[a]North Eastern Ohio is comprised of thirteen counties: (1) Ashland, (2) Ashtabula, (3) Cuyahoga, (4) Erie, (5) Geauga, (6) Lake, (7) Lorain, (8) Mahoning, (9) Medina, (10) Portage, (11) Richland, (12) Summit, (13) Trumbull.

[b]There were 14 junior high schools in local school districts in 1956.

were asked to refer the checklist, Form 1 (Appendix A), to the head of

the school library. Over one-third of the questionnaires, 439 from 85

of the 88 counties of Ohio were returned in usable form. Of this number,

149 were received from schools located within the thirteen counties

designated as North Eastern Ohio (NEO).[1] Although only 21.7 per cent of the schools on the original mailing list, which was based upon the 1955-56 Ohio Educational Directory, were in the latter group, their response constituted 33.9 per cent of all of the schools surveyed.

When the replies were checked according to the counties to which questionnaires were distributed,[2] the response from the schools in North Eastern Ohio was again found to be higher. Table 3.2 shows the interest of North Eastern Ohio to be greater than in the state as a whole. Over sixty per cent (60.3 per cent) of the schools in North Eastern Ohio completed the questionnaire, while only 32.6 per cent of the other schools responded.

TABLE 3.2

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES, 1956

| Area | Usable Returns | | No Response | | Total | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| NEO | 149 | 60.3 | 98 | 39.7 | 247 | 100.0 |
| Other 75 Counties | 290 | 32.6 | 601 | 67.5 | 891 | 100.1 |
| Total | 439 | 38.6 | 699 | 61.4 | 1,138 | 100.0 |

It was assumed that the general superiority of school libraries in larger urban areas would be indicated by the greater numbers and kinds of schools reporting from the different counties. Although city, local and exempted village schools were found in almost every area, the

[1](1) Ashland, (2) Ashtabula, (3) Cuyahoga, (4) Erie, (5) Geauga, (6) Lake, (7) Lorain, (8) Mahoning, (9) Medina, (10) Portage, (11) Richland, (12) Summit, (13) Trumbull.

[2]List of responding schools, Appendix A. Sources of 1956 Data on Services in Ohio's Public High School Libraries, Table 1.

proportion of city schools was greater in North Eastern Ohio than else-
where in the state; with 49.9 per cent of the responding city schools
being located in North Eastern Ohio, but with 75.3 per cent of the local
schools, and 82.1 per cent of the exempted village schools being outside
of the thirteen-county area comprising North Eastern Ohio (Table 3.1).

Of the responding junior high schools, 72.9 per cent were in
North Eastern Ohio (Table 3.1). Table 3.3 shows that these schools made
a 79.6 per cent response, while only 27.1 per cent of the schools in the
other 75 counties did so. North Eastern Ohio had 54 junior high schools
in 1956 when there were only 59 in other counties. Among the latter,
only 14 schools were in local school districts (Table 3.1).

TABLE 3.3

RESPONSES FROM JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO
AND ELSEWHERE IN OHIO, 1956

| Area | Usable Responses | | No Response | | Total | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| NEO | 43 | 79.6 | 11 | 20.4 | 54 | 100.0 |
| Other 75 Counties | 16 | 27.1 | 43 | 72.9 | 59 | 100.0 |
| Combined | 59 | 52.2 | 54 | 47.8 | 113 | 100.0 |

## Schools and Communities

In order to understand better the differences among Ohio high
school libraries, certain general information regarding the schools,
their libraries and their communities was requested. The sizes of the
schools, as shown by enrollments, are shown in Table 3.4.

One hundred fifty-two schools (70.4 per cent) with enrollments
between 100-499 reported 100 per cent student-use of the library. In
the 500-999 group, 65 per cent of the schools reported that 100 per cent

## TABLE 3.4

### USE OF LIBRARY ACCORDING TO SIZE OF SCHOOL

| Enrollment | Student Use | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 100% | | 50%-99% | | Under 50% | | Unknown | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 2,000 & up | 6 | 46.2 | 3 | 23.1 | 2 | 15.4 | 2 | 15.4 | 13 | 100.1 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 36 | 61.0 | 10 | 16.9 | 3 | 5.1 | 10 | 16.9 | 59 | 99.9 |
| 500-999 | 80 | 65.0 | 34 | 27.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 8 | 6.5 | 123 | 99.9 |
| 100-499 | 152 | 70.4 | 43 | 19.9 | 6 | 2.8 | 15 | 6.9 | 216 | 100.0 |
| 0-99 | 11 | 91.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 100.0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 |
| Total | 285 | 64.9 | 91 | 20.7 | 12 | 2.7 | 51 | 11.6 | 439 | 99.9 |

of their students used the library, and in schools with 1,000-1,999 students, only 61 per cent reported 100 per cent usage. That the pattern of use was in inverse proportion to the enrollment was evident. Although the smallest schools, with 0-99 students, had the largest proportion reporting 100 per cent usage (91.7 per cent), it could be assumed that only the most progressive schools in this category tended to respond to the questionnaire. In the largest schools, there may have been inadequate space, materials or personnel to afford such complete service.

Data expressed in Table 3.4 show that the majority of schools of every size had more students who used the library than who did not. Although 20.7 per cent reported 50-99 per cent usage, 64.9 per cent of all of the schools reported that 100 per cent of the student body used the library. Only 2.7 per cent of the schools reported usage below 50 per cent, and another 51 schools (11.6 per cent) did not know the extent of the service offered.

The questionnaire did not completely ascertain the number of teachers in every school in 1956, but it was found that in 38 of the 439 responding schools, 50 or more teachers in each school used the library services. Moreover, 406 schools reported some use by their teachers, and 12 schools said that all of their teachers used the school library. Thirty-three schools did not report on this item.

With respect to the area served by the libraries (Table 3.5), it was surprising to learn that 100 of the 439 schools served an area of from 25 to 49.9 square miles, and that 14 other schools served areas of

TABLE 3.5

AREA SERVED BY SCHOOLS, EXPRESSED IN SQUARE MILES

| Square Miles | Schools | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | No. | % |
| 100 and up | 14 | 3.2 |
| 50-99.9 | 47 | 10.7 |
| 25-49.9 | 100 | 22.8 |
| 5-24.9 | 72 | 16.4 |
| 0- 4.9 | 206 | 46.9 |
| Total | 439 | 100.0 |

100 or more square miles. Generally speaking, 53.1 per cent of the schools said that they served areas of five square miles or larger. It was apparent that with such distances and the problems of transportation it was often not feasible to expect extensive use of the library before and after school. Insofar as services were concerned, it would appear that smaller schools situated in smaller areas would have certain advantages with respect to use, despite the fact that larger units could be operated with greater economy.

## Physical Aspects of School Libraries

Form I was also designed to gather certain information relative to the physical aspects of the school libraries, including environment and equipment. Table 3.6 summarizes the basic data.

### TABLE 3.6

#### PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES

| | Yes | | No | | No Response | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Environment | | | | | | | | |
| Desirable location | 346 | 78.8 | 78 | 17.8 | 15 | 3.4 | 439 | 100.0 |
| Pleasant atmosphere | 371 | 84.5 | 54 | 12.3 | 14 | 3.2 | 439 | 100.0 |
| Adequate size | 205 | 46.7 | 218 | 49.7 | 16 | 3.6 | 439 | 100.0 |
| Storage | 186 | 42.4 | 241 | 54.9 | 12 | 2.7 | 439 | 100.0 |
| Workroom | 162 | 36.9 | 263 | 60.0 | 14 | 3.2 | 439 | 100.1 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | |
| Suitable tables and chairs | 326 | 74.3 | 103 | 23.5 | 10 | 2.3 | 439 | 100.1 |
| Adequate facilities for circulation | 338 | 77.0 | 90 | 20.5 | 11 | 2.5 | 439 | 100.0 |
| Card catalog | 392 | 89.3 | 40 | 9.1 | 7 | 1.6 | 439 | 100.0 |
| Vertical file(s) | 310 | 70.6 | 108 | 24.6 | 21 | 4.8 | 439 | 100.0 |

Concerning environment, the librarians were asked for their judgments as to the relative quality of three factors related to their own libraries: location, atmosphere, and size. The greatest number of librarians (371, or 84.5 per cent) felt that a pleasant atmosphere was the most desirable of the three, with location next. Less than half regarded their libraries as being adequate in size. Two hundred forty-one librarians reported that they had no storage space, and 60 per cent had no workrooms. Although write-in space was provided for naming other aspects of environment, nothing of consequence was mentioned.

With respect to furniture, 74.3 per cent of the librarians thought

they had suitable tables and chairs. It was quite unexpected, however, to have only 90 schools (20.5 per cent) express a need for better physical facilities for the circulation of library materials. With the possibility of employing any one of several methods of charging library materials, it would have been interesting to determine the particular method adopted by the majority of school libraries, and what effect the local system may have had on the judgments of adequacy.

Almost all of the libraries reported having a card catalog, but 40 schools (9.1 per cent) had none, and seven others failed to answer the question. Vertical files were reported in 310 schools (Table 3.6). It was notable, however, that 21 schools did not answer this question. It might be assumed that untrained personnel completed this segment of the questionnaire.

## Materials

Although it has never been wise or practical to judge the merits of a book collection exclusively by its size, many educators, and especially librarians, have counted the number of volumes to complete official reports ever since standards for libraries were first considered to be important. The total number of volumes could be used to demonstrate growth, especially when professional librarians selected new books and weeded their collections regularly so as to remove obsolete materials. Inasmuch as the earlier reports[1] specified the number of volumes owned, but not the number of titles, which would have given a more accurate and detailed figure on book stock in school libraries, Form I requested the number of volumes at the last inventory, and the number of textbooks

---

[1] Nolan, op. cit.

included in the total figure. It was decided, however, to disregard both the date of the inventory and the number of textbooks since neither would have appreciably altered the reports.

The data afforded certain meaningful comparisons with the Ohio study of 1948.[1] In 1948, the number of books apparently was considered adequate in the eight largest schools with 2,000 or more students. In 1956, 13 schools reported enrollments of 2,000 or more (Table 3.7).

TABLE 3.7

OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS OF DIFFERENT SIZES, 1956

| Enrollment | No. | % |
|---|---|---|
| 2,000 and up | 13 | 3.0 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 59 | 13.4 |
| 500- 999 | 123 | 28.0 |
| 100- 499 | 216 | 49.2 |
| 0- 99 | 12 | 2.7 |
| Unknown | 16 | 3.6 |
| Total | 439 | 99.9 |

Moreover, 7.1 per cent of all of the reporting schools had 10,000 volumes or more (Table 3.8) although only 3 per cent enrolled as many as 2,000 students.

It seemed safe to assume, therefore, that more of the largest schools had better-stocked libraries in 1956 than in 1943, despite the fact that the national library standards[2] remained unchanged.

In 1948, 60 schools out of a group of 71 reported enrollments of 1,000-1,999 students (Table 2.1), while 59 responded in 1956 (Table 3.7).

_____

[1] Ibid.

[2] A.L.A. Committee on Post-War Planning, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, op. cit., 43 p.

TABLE 3.8

BOOK STOCK IN OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES, 1956

| Number of Volumes | Schools | |
|---|---|---|
| | No. | % |
| 14,000 - Up | 8 | 1.8 |
| 12,000 - 13,999 | 10 | 2.3 |
| 10,000 - 11,999 | 13 | 3.0 |
| 8,000 - 9,999 | 26 | 5.9 |
| 6,000 - 7,999 | 40 | 9.1 |
| 4,000 - 5,999 | 66 | 15.0 |
| 2,000 - 3,999 | 147 | 33.5 |
| 0 - 1,999 | 98 | 22.3 |
| No Response | 31 | 7.1 |
| Total | 439 | 100.0 |

A.L.A. standards called for 7,000-10,000 volumes in libraries in schools of this size. By 1956, 66 schools, or 15 per cent of the 439 responding schools, had 6,000-9,999 volumes; and an additional 7.1 per cent owned larger collections (Table 3.8). Eight years earlier, one-half of the schools with 1,000-1,999 students met the A.L.A. standards (Table 2.1). The actual improvements in book collections in schools of this size may be somewhat disguised by comparing the 1956 sample which consisted of 38.6 per cent of the total schools (Table 3.2) with the 84.5 per cent included in the 1948 study (Table 2.1). Other gains were evident, although all of the smaller schools did not measure up to the national goals, and 51.9 per cent of the libraries served fewer than 500 students. By 1956, schools with 500-999 enrolled were expected to have 5,000-7,000 books (Table 2.2), but only about one-fourth in that category had 4,000-7,999 volumes (Table 3.8). Less than 4,000 books were owned by 245 schools, 55.8 per cent of the responding libraries. Although one-fourth

of these actually fell below A.L.A. standards, the improvement since 1948 was notable. Of the 101 schools in the 1948 survey, only one in each five met these standards (Table 2.1).

Perhaps the greatest school library growth occurred among the smallest schools. In 1948, there were 998 schools with less than 500 enrolled, but, unfortunately, no report on book stock was made. This would indicate that only small, generally unorganized book collections probably were to be found, but by 1956, 245 schools, constituting 55.8 per cent of the 439 responding schools, reported collections of less than 4,000 volumes and 33.5 per cent of them had at least 2,000 books (Table 3.8). None of the collections appeared to be extremely small although the smallest schools were required to own as few as 2,000 volumes to meet A.L.A. standards[1] which was ten books per pupil with a minimum of 2,000 volumes per school. Although the number of small schools apparently was greater in 1948 when 998 were reported in this category (Table 2.1), the 1956 figures showed only 228 schools with less than 500 students (Table 3.7). The combined groups of schools also showed a reduction of 42 high schools in Ohio between 1948 and 1956, thus reflecting the trend toward consolidation.

Another basic requirement for a good library is an adequate collection of magazines which have been selected by the trained librarian. Since odd lots of gift periodicals might add an overly-complimentary image to the magazine service, Form I not only asked for the number of current subscriptions, but for the number indexed in Readers' Guide.[2] The summary data were combined into Table 3.9. No attempt was made to

---

[1]Ibid., p. 21.

[2]Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, H. W. Wilson Company.

TABLE 3.9

NUMBER OF PERIODICALS IN OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES
AND THE NUMBER INDEXED IN READERS' GUIDE

| Total Number of Periodical Subscriptions | Schools | | Number Indexed in Readers' Guide | Schools | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | | No. | % |
| 125 | 1 | 0.2 | 90 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 105-119 | 6 | 1.4 | 80-89 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 90-104 | 8 | 1.8 | 70-89 | 2 | 0.5 |
| 75- 89 | 11 | 2.5 | 60-69 | 8 | 1.8 |
| 60- 74 | 29 | 6.6 | 50-59 | 11 | 2.5 |
| 45- 59 | 58 | 13.2 | 40-49 | 22 | 5.0 |
| 30- 44 | 100 | 22.8 | 30-39 | 49 | 11.2 |
| 15- 29 | 136 | 31.0 | 20-29 | 75 | 17.1 |
| 1- 14 | 60 | 13.7 | 10-19 | 89 | 20.3 |
| 0 | 4 | 0.9 | 1- 9 | 22 | 5.0 |
| | | | 0 | 17 | 3.9 |
| No Response | 26 | 5.9 | No Response | 142 | 32.3 |
| Total | 439 | 100.0 | Total | 439 | 100.0 |

relate the number of periodicals to the size of the school since there was no reason to believe that the number of magazines would differ greatly from the relative size of the book collections.

The greatest number of schools (136 or 31 per cent) had between 15 and 29 magazine subscriptions, and 100 schools (22.8 per cent) reported between 30 and 44 current periodicals. One school subscribed for 125, and four schools had none at all. There was no response from 26 schools.

A.L.A. standards recommended 15 to 25 magazines for schools with 200 students, with the number of subscriptions to be increased proportionately with higher enrollments.[1] Since 41.4 per cent of the schools had more than 500 students (Table 3.7), it would appear that nearly half

[1]A.L.A. Committee on Post-War Planning, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

of the schools would have subscribed to at least 50 magazines; however, Table 3.9 shows that only 25.7 per cent subscribed to more than 44. Although it would have required but a few moments to check the list of periodicals against the Readers' Guide, or its abridged edition which should have been available in every library, 142 schools did not answer the question (Table 3.9). It was assumed, therefore, that almost one-third (32.3 per cent) of the school libraries did not have access to this reference, or did not know about it. Seventeen of the remaining schools had no periodicals which were included in this basic list. Only 5.2 per cent of the schools had more than 50 of the Readers' Guide periodicals; 89 schools (20.3 per cent) had between 10 and 19 current subscriptions of the indexed magazines.

It seemed evident that, in 1956, a majority of the public high school libraries in Ohio failed to utilize the primary sources of current, relatively-inexpensive periodical materials.

With the exception of periodicals, Form I treated library ownership and non-book materials only in a very general way. According to the data, as reported in Table 3.10, 18 per cent of the 439 schools indexed films, filmstrips, slides, recordings, globes, charts or other media of audio-visual instruction in the school library, but only 9.6 per cent of the libraries were responsible for ordering them. The figures implied that 8.4 per cent of the libraries had a cooperative arrangement between an audio-visual department and the library, but also that approximately four-fifths of the libraries were not providing leadership in promoting the use of non-book materials. It was also ascertained that 20.5 per cent of the libraries circulated audio-visual materials borrowed by students and teachers.

TABLE 3-10

ROLE OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY AS AN INSTRUCTIONAL
MATERIALS CENTER, 1956

| Audio-Visual Materials | Yes | | No | | No Response | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 1. Indexed in library | 79 | 18.0 | 323 | 73.6 | 37 | 8.4 | 439 | 100.0 |
| 2. Circulated by library | 90 | 20.5 | 331 | 75.4 | 18 | 4.1 | 439 | 100.0 |
| 3. Ordered and purchased by library | 42 | 9.6 | 352 | 80.2 | 45 | 10.3 | 439 | 100.1 |
| Separate audio-visual department | 16 | 3.6 | | | | | | |

The topic of audio-visual materials was undoubtedly a troublesome
one for some of the librarians inasmuch as they took time to write notes
on the questionnaire to explain local conditions. For example, twenty-
two librarians mentioned their limited audio-visual services. It became
apparent that phonograph recordings were more likely to be provided than
films. Filmstrips, which are far less costly than 16 mm. films, were
used less by four of the 22 schools, and slides were mentioned only once.

The different methods of handling and purchasing audio-visual
materials by 31 librarians were: (1) a separate audio-visual department,
(2) through teachers, (3) the principal's office, (4) the board of edu-
cation, and (5) a centralized audio-visual exchange. Sixteen schools
(3.6 per cent) reported separate departments.

In 1956, slightly more than half of the 439 high school libraries
borrowed materials from other agencies in order to supplement their own
services. City and county libraries, and the Ohio State Library, sup-
plied books to supplement the collections in more than half of the

schools (Table 3.11). The service was initiated by the local librarians according to the procedures prescribed by the affiliated libraries. Fewer libraries borrowed audio-visual materials than books, but 165 schools (37.6 per cent) said that they borrowed these aids regularly. Only one school in ten sought audio-visual materials or services from museums of one kind or another. Distance doubtless often complicated delivery of large numbers of books, but mail service could have been used for special orders on an interloan basis.

### TABLE 3.11

SOURCES FOR THE SUPPLEMENTATION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS, 1956

| Library Materials | Yes | | No | | No Response | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 1. Books borrowed regularly from city, county or state library | 234 | 53.3 | 190 | 43.3 | 15 | 3.4 | 439 | 100.0 |
| 2. Audio-visual aids borrowed regularly from libraries, etc. | 165 | 37.6 | 233 | 53.1 | 41 | 9.3 | 439 | 100.0 |
| 3. Specimens borrowed from museums, etc. | 44 | 10.0 | 348 | 79.3 | 47 | 10.7 | 439 | 100.0 |

### Personnel

It is generally accepted that a well-qualified librarian is the first requirement for any library, for without the leadership in the professional planning of facilities, the selection and organization of books and related materials, and supervision and promotion of their use, there can be no real foundation for giving service.

> The school librarian is perhaps the most important factor in a full program of library service. A professional librarian who knows books and knows how to select, organize and interpret them;

a master teacher who understands children and knows what the
school should do for them; and a practical executive who is
skilled in organizing a variety of forces to produce effective
action--all are needed in the person of the successful school
librarian.[1]

In addition to requesting the number of staff members on library duty,
the questionnaire also asked for the amount of training possessed by
each member. In the 1949 report on Ohio libraries,[2] it was found that
only a relatively small number of librarians had completed one year's
study beyond the baccalaureate degree, as required for the Bachelor of
Science in Library Science degree, or more recently, for the Master's
Degree in Library Science granted by library schools accredited by the
A.L.A.

At the time of the last state survey (1945), the A.L.A. recom-
mended one full-time librarian for schools with less than 1,000 students,
and two to four full-time librarians plus one clerk for schools with
1,000-1,999 students.[3] The largest schools, with 2,000 or more enrolled,
were advised to provide a minimum of four librarians and two clerks, all
full-time.

At that time, as now, Ohio's schools were below standard with
respect to librarian-time available. Moreover, training of the librar-
ians was substandard. From 1948 to 1956, the state as a whole made
progress by filling 107 full-time professional positions in 98 of the
439 schools studied (Table 3.12). In 86 schools (17.6 per cent), a full-
time librarian was hired, and 12 other schools had a total of 21 librarians.

---

[1] National Education Association, Joint Committee, Schools and
Public Libraries Working Together in School Library Service (Washington:
National Education Association, 1941), p. 11.

[2] Nolan, op. cit., pp. 220-221.

[3] Ibid., pp. 220-221.

## TABLE 3.12

### EQUIVALENT FULL-TIME LIBRARIANS WITH A LIBRARY DEGREE IN SCHOOLS OF DIFFERENT SIZES, 1956

| No. of Trained Librarians FTE[a] | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000 & Up | | 1,000–1,999 | | 500–999 | | 100–499 | | 0–99 | | Unknown | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Over 1.0[b] | 5 | 38.5 | 5 | 8.5 | 2 | 1.6 | | | | | | | 12 | 2.7 |
| 1.0 | 6 | 46.2 | 33 | 55.9 | 39 | 31.7 | 7 | 3.2 | | | 1 | 6.3 | 86 | 19.6 |
| .9 | 1 | 7.7 | 7 | 11.9 | 13 | 10.6 | 1 | 0.5 | | | 1 | 6.3 | 23 | 5.2 |
| .8 | | | 5 | 8.5 | 5 | 4.1 | | | | | | | 10 | 2.3 |
| .7 | | | | | 4 | 3.3 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 6 | 1.4 |
| .6 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 5 | 1.2 |
| .5 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 5 | 1.2 |
| .4 | | | 2 | 3.4 | 3 | 2.4 | 7 | 3.2 | | | | | 12 | 2.7 |
| .3 | | | 1 | 1.7 | | | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| .2 | | | | | | | 4 | 1.9 | | | | | 4 | 0.9 |
| .1 | | | | | | | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 1 | 0.2 |
| Under .1 | | | | | | | 5 | 2.3 | | | | | 5 | 1.2 |
| .0 | | | | | 6 | 4.9 | 47 | 21.8 | 6 | 50.0 | 1 | 6.3 | 61 | 13.9 |
| No Response | 1 | 7.7 | 4 | 6.8 | 47 | 38.2 | 137 | 63.6 | 6 | 50.0 | 13 | 81.3 | 207 | 47.2 |
| Total | 13 | 100.1 | 59 | 100.1 | 123 | 100.0 | 216 | 100.2 | 12 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.2 | 439 | 100.2 |

[a] Full-time employee.

[b] Twenty-one FTE librarians were reported in schools with over 2,000 enrollment, indicating more than one librarian in certain schools.

Although this was less than one-fourth (24.4 per cent) of the total
sample, the number was greater than the total number in the state eight
years earlier (Table 2.1). For more detailed observations, the data in
Table 2.1 should be compared with the four tables on personnel which
follow immediately below.

By 1956, full-time professional librarians staffed as many as
22.3 per cent of the school libraries (Table 3.12), and part-time profes-
sionals served 20 or more hours per week in another 11.3 per cent of the
libraries. Only 5.5 per cent of the schools had professional librarians
who worked up to 20 hours per week. The table also shows that the high-
est percentage of full-time trained librarians was found in schools with
enrollments of 1,000 or more; 38.5 per cent of the schools which reported
more than one full-time trained librarian were among the five schools
with 2,000 or more students. The largest percentage of schools (55.9
per cent) with a full-time professional librarian was in schools with
1,000-1,999 enrolled. Schools with 100-499 students tended to have less
trained personnel; in fact, 18 of these schools reported that they had
trained librarians less than half time, and five had fewer than four
hours of professional library service each week.

Inasmuch as 13.9 per cent of the 439 schools reported no profes-
sionally-trained librarians and 47.2 per cent more did not fill in the
item, it seemed evident that more than three-fifths of the high school
libraries were functioning without professional leadership (Table 3.12).

In 1948, the schools in the 500-999 size-category had three out
of each five librarians with more than 15 semester hours of library sci-
ence.[1] In 1956, the larger number, 19 full-time librarians with more

---

[1] Ibid.

than 15 semester hours of library science training were found in schools
of the same size, but less than one fifth of the 1956 sample had librar-
ians with equivalent training (Table 3.13). However, 39 schools in this
group had one fully-trained librarian per school in contrast to only
eight schools with comparable personnel in 1948 (Table 3.12).

Only 18.7 per cent of all of the schools had librarians with 15
or more semester hours of library science (Table 3.13), and less than
10 per cent were employed on a full-time basis. Two schools reported
more than one full-time librarian, and 5.2 per cent said they had a li-
brarian with these qualifications for 20 to 36 hours each week. Only
3 per cent had the librarian assigned for fewer hours, although two
schools reported that their librarian had more than 15 semester hours of
library science training but worked in the library less than four hours
per week (Table 3.13).

Another group of schools reported partially-trained librarians
but with less than 15 hours of library science (Table 3.14). The per-
centage (15.2) was slightly less than for the latter group with advanced
training. One-fourth of the smallest schools had librarians with less
than 15 semester hours of library science who were scheduled for eight
hours a week in the library. Fourteen schools had full-time librarians
with minimum library training, and only one was employed in a school
with 2,000 students (Table 3.14).

Although the percentage of schools (33.9) in the combined groups
having only partially-trained librarians was smaller than the 38.9 per
cent which had professional librarians, the need for specialized training
was recognized by the reported efforts of almost three-fourths of Ohio's
public high schools to employ librarians with training in library science.

TABLE 3.13

NON-DEGREE LIBRARIANS WITH AT LEAST FIFTEEN SEMESTER HOURS OF
LIBRARY SCIENCE TRAINING, 1956

| No. of Librarians FTE | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000 & Up | | 1,000–1,999 | | 500–999 | | 100–499 | | 0–99 | | Unknown | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Over 1.0 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 0.8 | 16 | 7.4 | 1 | 8.3 | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| 1.0 | | | 3 | 5.1 | 19 | 15.4 | 3 | 1.4 | | | 1 | 6.3 | 40 | 9.0 |
| .9 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 5 | 4.1 | | | | | | | 9 | 2.0 |
| .8 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| .7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0 |
| .6 | | | | | 3 | 2.4 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 4 | 0.9 |
| .5 | | | 3 | 5.1 | 5 | 4.1 | 3 | 1.4 | | | | | 8 | 1.8 |
| .4 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 3 | 1.4 | | | | | 4 | 0.9 |
| .3 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 3 | 0.7 |
| .2 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 6 | 1.4 |
| .1 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| Under .1 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| 0 or No Response | 13 | 100.0 | 51 | 86.4 | 84 | 68.3 | 183 | 84.7 | 11 | 91.7 | 15 | 93.8 | 357 | 81.3 |
| Total | 13 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 123 | 99.9 | 216 | 100.1 | 12 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.1 | 439 | 100.0 |

TABLE 3.14

NUMBER OF LIBRARY STAFF MEMBERS WITH LESS THAN FIFTEEN SEMESTER HOURS OF
LIBRARY SCIENCE TRAINING, 1956

| No. of Librarians 6 to 15 Hrs. of Library Science (FTE) | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000 & Up | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 100-499 | | 0-99 | | Unknown | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Over 1.0 | | | | | | | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| 1.0 | 1 | 7.7 | | | 4 | 3.3 | 7 | 3.2 | | | | | 12 | 2.7 |
| .9 | | | | | | | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 1 | 0.2 |
| .8 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.9 | | | 2 | 12.5 | 5 | 1.2 |
| .7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0 |
| .6 | | | | | 3 | 2.4 | 4 | 1.9 | | | | | 7 | 1.6 |
| .5 | | | | | | | 8 | 3.7 | | | | | 8 | 1.8 |
| .4 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 5 | 2.3 | | | | | 6 | 1.4 |
| .3 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| .2 | | | | | 3 | 2.4 | 7 | 3.2 | 3 | 25.0 | | | 13 | 3.0 |
| .1 | | | | | | | 7 | 3.2 | | | | | 7 | 1.6 |
| Under .1 | | | | | | | 3 | 1.4 | | | | | 3 | 0.7 |
| 0 or No Response | 12 | 92.3 | 59 | 100.0 | 110 | 89.4 | 169 | 78.2 | 9 | 75.0 | 14 | 87.5 | 373 | 85.0 |
| Total | 13 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 123 | 99.9 | 216 | 99.9 | 12 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 439 | 100.2 |

Another group of schools (29.2 per cent) had faculty members assigned as librarians who had no formal training in library science (Table 3.15). Of these, 46 schools had full-time librarians and four others had more than one librarian. In some instances, however, a school had as little as four hours per week and only 14.1 per cent reported more than half-time service.

The professional staffing of high school libraries in 1956 was obviously less than adequate as shown by the varying personnel time allotted the libraries as well as the distinct differences in their training.

> In utilizing all personnel to best advantage, it is important to distinguish between professional and clerical jobs and to provide clerical personnel. It is false economy to expect professional personnel to devote their highly skilled and well-paid time to routine chores. The librarian should have time to work with students and teachers directly, encouraging greatest possible use of the library and its resources.[1]

The standards for Ohio in 1947, summarized in Table 2.4, recommended one or more trained library assistants in schools with 800 or more students, but did not specifically mention the need for clerical assistance. The A.L.A. (Table 2.1) recommended one clerk for schools with 500-1,900 enrolled, and two clerks for schools with 2,000 or more students. Eight of the largest schools reported clerical help in various amounts beginning with one hour per week (Table 3.16). Among the 59 schools with enrollments of 1,000-1,999, only 21 had any clerical assistance. The smallest number of library clerks per school was found in libraries serving 100-499 students. Among the 20.6 per cent of the total sample reporting clerical assistance, 10.4 per cent were employed full time and 14 schools (3.2 per cent) had the equivalent of more than one

---

[1]Irving E. Lane, "An Administrator Looks at the Library," comp., Charles L. Trinkner, _Better Libraries Make Better Schools_ (Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1962), p. 59.

## TABLE 3.15

### LIBRARY STAFF MEMBERS WITH NO LIBRARY SCIENCE TRAINING, 1956

| No. of Faculty Members FTE | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000 & Up | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 100-499 | | 0-99 | | Unknown | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Over 1.0 | | | | | | | 4 | 1.9 | | | | | 4 | 0.9 |
| 1.0 | | | 2 | 3.4 | 8 | 6.5 | 32 | 14.8 | 3 | 25.0 | 1 | 6.3 | 46 | 10.5 |
| .9 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 4 | 1.9 | | | | | 7 | 1.6 |
| .8 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 3 | 0.7 |
| .7 | | | | | | | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 1 | 0.2 |
| .6 | | | | | | | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 1 | 0.2 |
| .5 | | | | | | | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| .4 | | | | | 2 | 1.6 | 11 | 5.1 | | | | | 13 | 3.0 |
| .3 | | | | | | | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| .2 | 1 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.7 | 3 | 2.4 | 13 | 6.0 | 2 | 16.7 | 5 | 31.3 | 25 | 5.7 |
| .1 | 1 | 7.7 | 2 | 3.4 | 1 | 0.8 | 8 | 3.7 | 4 | 33.3 | | | 16 | 3.6 |
| Under .1 | | | | | 1 | 0.8 | 6 | 2.8 | 1 | 8.3 | | | 8 | 1.8 |
| 0 or No Response | 11 | 84.6 | 53 | 89.8 | 105 | 85.4 | 130 | 60.2 | 2 | 16.7 | 10 | 62.5 | 311 | 70.8 |
| Total | 13 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 | 123 | 99.9 | 216 | 100.1 | 12 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.1 | 439 | 100.0 |

TABLE 3.16

CLERICAL ASSISTANTS ON THE LIBRARY STAFF IN 1956

| Clerk FTE | 2,000 & Up | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 100-499 | | 0-99 | | Unknown | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Over 1.0 | 2 | 15.4 | 5 | 8.5 | 2 | 1.6 | 4 | 1.9 | | | 1 | 6.3 | 14 | 3.2 |
| 1.0 | 4 | 30.8 | 11 | 18.6 | 23 | 18.7 | 8 | 3.7 | | | | | 46 | 10.4 |
| .9 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | | | | | | | 3 | 0.7 |
| .8 | 1 | 7.7 | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.8 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 4 | 0.8 |
| .7 | | | | | | | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 1 | 0.2 |
| .6 | | | 1 | 1.7 | | | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 2 | 0.4 |
| .5 | | | | | 2 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 3 | 0.7 |
| .4 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 5 | 1.2 |
| .3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0.0 |
| .2 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 3 | 1.4 | | | | | 6 | 1.4 |
| .1 | 1 | 7.7 | | | 1 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.9 | 3 | 25.0 | | | 7 | 1.6 |
| 0 or No Response | 5 | 38.5 | 38 | 64.4 | 88 | 74.5 | 193 | 89.4 | 9 | 75.0 | 15 | 93.8 | 348 | 79.3 |
| Total | 13 | 100.1 | 59 | 100.0 | 123 | 99.8 | 216 | 100.2 | 12 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.1 | 439 | 99.9 |

full-time clerk. An unusually large number, 348 schools, either failed to answer this item or reported no clerical service available.

It would seem that the extreme shortage in clerical staff must have been primarily the result of insufficient funds for salaries. No other condition would satisfactorily explain why in 1956, 79.3 per cent of Ohio's high school libraries did not employ clerical personnel (Table 3.16).

It was difficult to assess the exact number of schools that actually met the A.L.A. postwar standards for personnel, although it was possible to reach a very close estimate. It has been ascertained that all of the schools with as many as 200 students needed a librarian and a clerk.[1] Therefore, with 12 schools of less than 100 enrolled added to one-half of the 216 schools with 100-499 enrolled (assuming 50 per cent had under 200 students) together with 16 more schools for which the enrollment was not determined from the data, as many as 136 (21.0 per cent) schools could have met the standards by employing a part-time or teacher librarian (Table 3.7). Tables 3.13 and 3.14 show that as many as 142 librarians were employed part-time although some of the schools had more than one. Of the remaining 303 schools, the 62 with enrollments over 1,000 needed two to four librarians. It was unlikely that many of them had the staff required, but Table 3.12 showed that 21 librarians served the twelve largest schools. At least five of those presumably were meeting the standards, and since 86 trained librarians worked full-time, another 86 schools were added to the qualified list. Seventy-three more trained librarians worked part-time affording approximately 36 of the remaining schools standard service.

---

[1]A.L.A. Committee on Post-War Planning, _School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow_, _op. cit._, pp. 16-18.

The total number of schools meeting A.L.A. standards for professional staff in 1956 was calculated to be 263, or 60.9 per cent of all the public high schools in Ohio.

Table 3.16 showed that only 91 schools had any clerical personnel in 1956, yet to meet the standards 208 full-time and 120 part-time clerks were needed. Only 60 schools (13.7 per cent) met the standards (Table 3.16). Statistically, only 13.7 per cent of the school libraries in 1956 met all of the requirements of the A.L.A. personnel standards.

Nearly 80 per cent, or 341, of the 439 schools reported programs employing student assistance (Table 3.17). One smaller school said that 110 students regularly assisted with certain library duties, while six other schools of comparable size did not use any student helpers. Between five and nine student assistants helped in 20 per cent of the school libraries. It can be surmized that students were often used in lieu of paid clerical personnel since it was shown that 79.3 per cent of the libraries were lacking clerical assistance (Table 3.16).

Students may volunteer their services to the school library in order to earn class credit, honor points, or service awards, but the growth and development of the individual is of paramount importance.[1] The range of duties suggested by Douglas was very broad and required careful planning and supervision to administer the program effectively.

> A carefully directed plan of student help makes possible further utilization of the professional services for which the librarian was trained without jeopardizing the efficient operation of the library.[2]

---

[1]Mary Peacock Douglas, The Pupil Assistant in the School Library, American Library Association (1957), pp. 17-18.

[2]Ibid., p. 2.

TABLE 3.17

NUMBER OF STUDENT ASSISTANTS IN LIBRARIES OF DIFFERENT SIZES, 1956

| No. of Student Assistants | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000 & Up | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 100-499 | | 0-99 | | Unknown | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 75 & over | | | | | | | 1ᵃ | 0.5 | | | | | 1 | 0.2 |
| 70-74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65-69 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60-64 | | | | | 1 | 8.2 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| 55-59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50-54 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 3 | 2.4 | | | | | | | 4 | 0.9 |
| 45-49 | | | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 0.8 | | | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| 40-44 | | | | | 2 | 1.6 | | | | | | | 2 | 0.5 |
| 35-39 | | | 2 | 3.4 | 3 | 2.4 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 6 | 1.4 |
| 30-34 | 3 | 23.1 | 11 | 18.6 | 4 | 3.3 | 1 | 0.5 | | | | | 16 | 3.6 |
| 25-29 | | | 5 | 8.5 | 10 | 8.1 | 2 | 0.9 | | | | | 20 | 4.6 |
| 20-24 | | | 9 | 15.3 | 11 | 8.9 | 6 | 2.8 | | | 1 | 6.3 | 27 | 6.2 |
| 15-19 | 2 | 15.4 | 10 | 17.0 | 16 | 13.0 | 20 | 9.3 | | | 1 | 6.3 | 49 | 11.2 |
| 10-14 | 2 | 15.4 | 11 | 18.6 | 15 | 12.2 | 36 | 16.7 | | | 2 | 12.5 | 66 | 15.0 |
| 5-9 | 1 | 7.7 | 3 | 5.1 | 19 | 15.4 | 59 | 27.3 | 3 | 25.0 | 3 | 18.8 | 88 | 20.0 |
| 1-4 | 2 | 15.4 | 2 | 3.4 | 15 | 12.2 | 31 | 14.4 | 5 | 41.7 | 3 | 18.8 | 58 | 13.2 |
| 0 | | | 1 | 1.7 | | | 6 | 2.8 | | | | | 7 | 1.6 |
| No Responseᵇ | 3 | 23.1 | 3 | 5.1 | 23 | 18.7 | 52 | 24.1 | 4 | 33.3 | 6 | 37.5 | 91 | 20.7 |
| Number of Schools | 13 | 100.1 | 59 | 100.1 | 123 | 99.8 | 216 | 100.3 | 12 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.2 | 439 | 100.1 |

ᵃ110 was the maximum number reported.

ᵇIt was assumed that student assistants were not utilized in these schools.

In order to make the experience worthwhile, guidance and training in the arrangement and use of the library, classification schemes, the card catalog, Readers' Guide and other commonly used reference tools must be provided.[1] Such experience prepares students to use the library more effectively. Douglas recognized the importance of variety in assigned work and listed specific duties which could be given to students with different interests. These duties encompassed shelving of books, housekeeping, care of reserve-materials, book processing, magazine and newspaper services, vertical file services, audio-visual services, publicity and public relations, reference services, cataloging and order, and general clerical services.[2]

Although it is desirable for students to participate in the service program of their library, in her emphasis, Douglas may have inadvertently discouraged the employment of more adult personnel for clerical and reference functions.

The present 1956 survey showed great variation in the number of student assistants. As one might expect, the number tended to increase with the size of the school, although the thirteen largest schools averaged fewer assistants than did schools in the two smaller categories immediately below.

Table 3.18 helps somewhat to clarify the more detailed Table 3.17. The mean for all of the reporting schools was 10.3 student assistants per school. Schools with 1,000-1,999 students averaged 20 student assistants each, but the largest schools averaged only 11.7 student assistants each. The largest category (216 schools) averaged 7.8 student assistants.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] Ibid., pp. 3-11.

**TABLE 3.18**

439 OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS WITH VARYING NUMBERS OF STUDENT ASSISTANTS
IN 1956—MEDIAN SHOWN FOR EACH ENROLLMENT CATEGORY

| Enrollment | No. of Schools | Numbers of Student Assistants Per School | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | High | Low | Range | Median |
| 2,000 and Up | 13 | 29 | 1 | 28 | 11.7 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 59 | 54 | | 54 | 20.0 |
| 500-999 | 123 | 64 | 1 | 63 | 13.6 |
| 100-499 | 216 | 110 | | 110 | 7.8 |
| 0-99 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 2.8 |
| Unknown | 16 | 24 | 1 | 23 | 5.7 |
| Combined | 439 | 110 | | 110 | 10.3 |

Nine-tenths of the libraries in schools, with enrollments of 500
and over, had a paid staff member on duty before and after school, while
only two-fifths of the smaller schools provided such service (Table 3.19).

**TABLE 3.19**

DAILY LIBRARY HOURS WITH SERVICES OF A PAID LIBRARIAN
IN SCHOOLS OF DIFFERENT SIZES, 1956

| Category | No. of Schools | Open Before and After School | | Open Almost Every Period | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | % | No. | % |
| 2,000 and Up | 13 | 13 | 100.0 | 12 | 92.3 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 59 | 53 | 89.8 | 49 | 83.1 |
| 500-999 | 123 | 97 | 78.9 | 99 | 80.5 |
| 100-499 | 216 | 80 | 37.0 | 68 | 31.5 |
| 0-99 | 12 | 5 | 41.7 | 6 | 50.0 |
| No Response | 16 | 16 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 |
| Total | 439 | 264 | 60.1 | 250 | 56.9 |

The greatest lack of such service occurred in the schools with 100-499 students, where only 37 per cent had at least one paid staff member available before and after school. In the 500-999 category, the greatest number of schools (99, or 80.5 per cent) had a staff member available during almost every period of the day. Considering the entire group of schools, 56.9 per cent reported a paid staff member on duty almost every period.

In the questionnaire spaces provided for voluntary comments, 21 schools described one or another form for providing service. It was noteworthy that none used volunteer library aids or clerks.

One school, in the 500-999 group, also opened its library one evening each week, while the other 20 schools reported that their libraries were open only part-time. Fourteen schools in the 100-499 bracket said the library was open from two to four periods per day, or on two to four days per week. Twenty schools expressed concern over their limited hours of service, but many more did not, although their shortcomings were apparent and great.

## Budget

As used in the present study, the term budget was intended to relate to the amount of money allocated for books and other materials of instruction handled by the school library, as well as for the ordinary supplies and equipment required for circulating and maintaining the book collection. Salaries were not intended to be included although it was surmized that in some cases they were. To minimize the error produced if salaries were included, Table 3.20 was constructed so as to report the total budget on a ten-point scale ranging from $1.00 to $5,000-and-up. The greatest number of schools (26.4 per cent) spent between $500 and $999.99 for library materials and services in 1956. The next largest

TABLE 3.20

TOTAL BUDGETS FOR OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN
NORTH EASTERN OHIO (NEO) AND OTHER COUNTIES
1956

| Funds from All Available Sources | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000 and up | | | | 1,000-1,999 | | | | 500-999 | | | | 100-499 | | | |
| | NEO | | Other | | NEO | | Other | | NEO | | Other | | NEO | | Other | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| $5,000 and up | | | 1 | 12.5 | 5 | 16.7 | 2 | 6.9 | | | 4 | 5.7 | 2 | 3.9 | 2 | 1.2 |
| $4,000-$4,999.99 | 1 | 20.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 3.5 | | | 2 | 2.9 | | | | |
| $3,500-$3,999.99 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1.4 | 4 | 7.7 | 2 | 1.2 |
| $3,000-$3,499.99 | 2 | 40.0 | | | 2 | 6.7 | 2 | 6.9 | 1 | 1.9 | 4 | 5.7 | | | | |
| $2,500-$2,999.99 | | | | | 1 | 3.3 | 2 | 6.9 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 2.9 | 2 | 3.9 | 1 | 0.6 |
| $2,000-$2,499.99 | 2 | 40.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 3.3 | | | 5 | 9.4 | 1 | 1.4 | | | | |
| $1,500-$1,999.99 | | | | | 6 | 20.0 | 11 | 37.9 | 9 | 17.0 | 6 | 8.6 | 4 | 7.7 | 9 | 5.5 |
| $1,000-$1,499.99 | | | | | 6 | 20.0 | 6 | 20.7 | 13 | 24.5 | 11 | 15.7 | 10 | 19.2 | 16 | 9.8 |
| $ 500-$ 999.99 | | | 1 | 12.5 | 2 | 6.7 | 2 | 6.9 | 16 | 30.2 | 22 | 31.4 | 17 | 32.7 | 50 | 30.5 |
| $ 1.00-$ 499.99 | | | | | | | 1 | 3.5 | 1 | 1.9 | 6 | 8.6 | | | 54 | 32.9 |
| 0 or No Response | | | 3 | 37.5 | 5 | 16.7 | 2 | 6.9 | 6 | 11.3 | 11 | 15.7 | 13 | 25.0 | 30 | 18.3 |
| Total | 5 | 100.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.1 | 29 | 100.1 | 53 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.1 | 164 | 100.0 |

TABLE 3.20--Continued

| Funds from All Available Sources | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-99 | | | | Unknown | | | | Combined | | | | | |
| | NEO | | Other | | NEO | | Other | | NEO | | Other | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| $5,000 and up | | | | | 1 | 14.3 | | | 8 | 5.4 | 9 | 3.1 | 17 | 3.9 |
| $4,000-$4,999.99 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 1.3 | 5 | 1.7 | 7 | 1.6 |
| $3,500-$3,999.99 | | | | | | | | | 5 | 3.4 | 3 | 1.0 | 8 | 1.8 |
| $3,000-$3,499.99 | | | | | | | | | 5 | 3.4 | 4 | 1.4 | 9 | 2.1 |
| $2,500-$2,999.99 | | | | | | | | | 5 | 3.4 | 4 | 1.4 | 9 | 2.1 |
| $2,000-$2,499.99 | | | | | | | | | 8 | 5.4 | 5 | 1.7 | 13 | 3.0 |
| $1,500-$1,999.99 | | | 1 | 10.0 | | | 1 | 11.1 | 19 | 12.8 | 26 | 9.0 | 45 | 10.3 |
| $1,000-$1,499.99 | | | 3 | 30.0 | 1 | 14.3 | 3 | 33.3 | 29 | 19.4 | 36 | 12.4 | 65 | 14.8 |
| $ 500-$ 999.99 | | | | | | | | | 36 | 24.2 | 80 | 27.6 | 116 | 26.4 |
| $ 1.00-$ 499.99 | | | 6 | 60.0 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 22.2 | 14 | 9.4 | 69 | 23.8 | 83 | 18.9 |
| 0 or No Response | | | | | | | 3 | 33.3 | 18 | 12.1 | 49 | 16.9 | 67 | 15.3 |
| Total | 2 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 9 | 99.9 | 142 | 100.2 | 290 | 100.0 | 432 | 100.2 |

group spent less than $500.

Only 9.4 per cent of the schools from North Eastern Ohio fell into the budget range of $1.00 to $499.99, whereas 23.8 per cent were found elsewhere in Ohio. Among the schools which did not report library budget figures, eighteen were located in North Eastern Ohio, and 49 in other areas.

Table 3.20 shows that fewer schools reported budgets of $2,000 or over than the more modest budgets of $1,500 or less. Moreover, a higher percentage of the North Eastern Ohio schools had larger library budget allocations than did the schools in other counties. While 5.4 per cent of the school libraries in North Eastern Ohio spent $5,000 or more for materials, equipment and services, only 3.1 per cent of the libraries in other counties had comparable budgets. Among the North Eastern Ohio schools, 22.3 per cent spent $2,000 or more for their libraries in 1956. This was more than twice the percentage of schools found in the 75 other counties, where only 10.3 per cent had a comparable budget.

Table 3.21 shows schools arranged into four budget categories. For example, 23.1 per cent of the schools with 2,000 or more students operated on a budget of less than $500, while 61.5 per cent of the schools in the same size category had between $2,000 and $4,999.99. Only 7.7 per cent of the schools in this group had as much as $5,000. Among the schools with 1,000-1,999 students, over half (55.9 per cent) had budgets of $500-$1,999.99, while some schools of similar size (11.8 per cent) had $5,000 or more. Moreover, 13.6 per cent had under $500 for the entire library program in 1956, or less than one-tenth as much as certain other schools of the same general size.

TABLE 3.21

LIBRARY BUDGET ACCORDING TO SIZE OF SCHOOL, 1956

| Budget | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000 & up | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 100-499 | | 0-99 | | Unknown | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| $5,000 and up | 1 | 7.7 | 7 | 11.8 | 4 | 3.3 | 4 | 1.9 | | | 1 | 6.3 | 17 | 3.9 |
| $2,000-$4,999.99 | 8 | 61.5 | 11 | 18.6 | 18 | 14.6 | 9 | 4.2 | | | | | 46 | 10.5 |
| $ 500-$1,999.99 | 1 | 7.7 | 33 | 55.9 | 77 | 62.6 | 106 | 49.1 | 4 | 33.3 | 5 | 31.3 | 226 | 51.5 |
| Under $500 | 3 | 23.1 | 8 | 13.6 | 24 | 19.5 | 97 | 44.9 | 8 | 66.7 | 10 | 62.5 | 150 | 34.2 |
| Total | 13 | 100.0 | 59 | 99.9 | 123 | 100.0 | 216 | 100.1 | 12 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.1 | 439 | 100.1 |

In fact, more than half of all the schools (51.5 per cent) reported budgets ranging between $500 and $1,999.99. The greatest percentage of schools with 500-999 enrolled (62.6 per cent) spent that amount but less than 20 per cent of the schools in that group spent under $500. Almost one-half of the schools with 100-499 students had between $500 and $1,999.99, and nearly as many (44.9 per cent) had lesser allocations.

The very small schools differed from the others in that none reported a budget of $2,000 or more, and two-thirds of them had less than $500.

Factors which affected library expenditures or total budgets were the age of the school, the changes in enrollment, interest of the administration, the faculty, and the librarian, and the availability and extent of services of other libraries. It became evident also that some of the schools with the highest total budgets had earmarked library funds for major equipment and staff salaries. An attempt was made to check that assumption. Inasmuch as eight of the 149 schools in North Eastern Ohio, and only seventeen in the entire state, reported library expenditures of $5,000 or more, it seemed fair to rule that salaries were not generally included in the library budgets. Eleven schools that reported unusually high budgets were contacted by telephone or letter and asked: (1) how much of the sum reported was spent for library materials and processing, (2) what part of the specified amount was used for salaries, and (3) what major equipment was purchased from that amount. Nine of the schools had included the salary paid to the librarians, and in each case the amount for purchasing and maintaining printed materials was found to be between one-quarter and one-half of the entire budget. Two

of the schools had purchased additional shelving, and in each of the schools more than $500 was allocated for supplies. No audio-visual costs were included.

> For the purchase of books, periodicals, and other printed materials and supplies for rebinding in an organized library unit in a school of 200 pupils or fewer, the minimum annual budget should be not less than $300.[1]

The majority of the schools, all sizes combined (51.5 per cent), spent $500-$1,999.99 on libraries in 1956 (Table 3.21). Table 3.22 was prepared especially to show the size of high schools in North Eastern Ohio. Two-thirds had enrollments between 100 and 1,000 students each. Table 3.23 shows the number of schools in each of the thirteen counties in relation to the dollars allocated to the school library. Cuyahoga County, with 56 schools in the sample, ranked first in both the number of schools and in their budgets for libraries. Three other counties, Lake, Portage and Richland, had one school each with a budget of $5,000 or more (Table 3.23), and no county, other than Cuyahoga, had a school with 2,000 or more students (Table 3.22). Cuyahoga County reported 15 schools with enrollments of 1,000-1,999, followed by Mahoning with five, Richland with three, Lake with two schools, and Ashland, Erie, Lorain, Summit and Trumbull counties each with one. To serve their students reasonably well, library budgets for printed materials should be from $1,500 to $2,000 for the 30 schools in this category.[2] According to Table 3.23, 19 schools spent that amount, while 33 others had larger budgets. This was not mistaken as conclusive evidence that the schools in North Eastern Ohio tended to receive support in keeping with the

---

[1] A.L.A. Committee on Post-War Planning, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, op. cit., p. 23.

[2] Ibid., p. 23.

TABLE 3.22

NUMBER AND SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE THIRTEEN COUNTIES OF NORTH EASTERN OHIO, 1956

| Enrollment | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2,000 and up | No. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| | % | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.4 |
| 1,000-1,900 | No. | 1 | | 15 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 5 | | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 30 |
| | % | 50.0 | | 26.8 | 16.7 | | 33.3 | 10.0 | 31.3 | | | 50.0 | 8.3 | 11.1 | 20.1 |
| 500-999 | No. | | 1 | 28 | | | 3 | 2 | 9 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 53 |
| | % | | 11.1 | 50.0 | | | 50.0 | 20.0 | 56.3 | | 14.3 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 44.4 | 35.6 |
| 100-499 | No. | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 52 |
| | % | 50.0 | 66.6 | 12.5 | 66.7 | 75.0 | 16.7 | 70.0 | 12.5 | 83.3 | 85.7 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 44.4 | 34.9 |
| 0-99 | No. | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| | % | | | 1.8 | 16.7 | | | | | | | | | | 1.3 |
| Unknown | No. | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 3 | | 7 |
| | % | | 22.2 | | | 25.0 | | | | 16.7 | | | 25.0 | | 4.7 |
| Total | No. | 2 | 9 | 56 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 149 |
| | % | 100.0 | 99.9 | 100.0 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.9 | 99.9 | 100.0 |

[a]Counties are: (1) Ashland, (2) Ashtabula, (3) Cuyahoga, (4) Erie, (5) Geauga, (6) Lake, (7) Lorain, (2) Mahoning, (9) Medina, (10) Portage, (11) Richland, (12) Summit, (13) Trumbull.

TABLE 3.23

BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN THE
THIRTEEN COUNTIES[a] OF NORTH EASTERN OHIO, 1956

| Funds from All Available Sources Fines Included | | County[a] | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | |
| $5,000 and up | No. | | | 5 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 8 |
| | % | | | 8.9 | | | | | | | 14.3 | 16.7 | | | 5.4 |
| $4,000-4,999.99 | No. | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | % | | | 1.8 | | | 16.7 | | | | | 16.7 | | | 1.3 |
| $3,500-3,999.99 | No. | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| | % | | | 8.9 | | | | | | | | | | | 3.4 |
| $3,000-3,499.99 | No. | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 5 |
| | % | | | 3.6 | | | | 10.0 | 6.3 | | | | | | 3.4 |
| $2,500-2,999.99 | No. | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 5 |
| | % | | | 3.6 | 16.7 | | | | | 16.7 | | 16.7 | 8.3 | | 3.4 |
| $2,000-2,499.99 | No. | | | 4 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 8 |
| | % | | | 7.1 | | | | 10.0 | 6.3 | 16.7 | | | | 11.1 | 5.4 |
| $1,500-1,999.99 | No. | | | 12 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 19 |
| | % | | | 21.4 | 16.7 | | 33.3 | 10.0 | | | 14.3 | | 8.3 | 11.1 | 12.8 |
| $1,000-1,499.99 | No. | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 29 |
| | % | 50.0 | 11.1 | 8.9 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 33.3 | | 50.0 | 33.3 | 14.3 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 55.5 | 19.4 |
| $ 500-999.99 | No. | 1 | 1 | 11 | | | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 36 |
| | % | 50.0 | 11.1 | 19.6 | | | 16.7 | 40.0 | 31.3 | 16.7 | 42.9 | 17.7 | 41.7 | 11.1 | 24.2 |
| $ 1.00-499.99 | No. | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| | % | | 33.3 | 5.4 | 33.3 | 25.0 | | 30.0 | 6.3 | | 14.3 | | 8.3 | 11.1 | 9.4 |
| 0 or Unknown | No. | | 4 | 6 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | | 18 |
| | % | | 44.4 | 10.7 | | 25.0 | | | | 16.7 | | 16.7 | 25.0 | | 12.1 |
| TOTAL | No. | 2 | 9 | 56 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 149 |
| | % | 100.0 | 99.9 | 99.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.2 | 100.1 | 100.1 | 100.2 | 99.9 | 99.9 | 100.2 |

[a]Counties are: (1) Ashland, (2) Ashtabula, (3) Cuyahoga, (4) Erie, (5) Geauga, (6) Lake, (7) Lorain, (8) Mahoning, (9) Medina, (10) Portage, (11) Richland, (12) Summit, (13) Trumbull.

national minimum standards because the amounts specified in the standards were restricted to printed materials and supplies, and rebinding.

Cuyahoga County had 28 schools in the 500-999 category that participated in the present study (Table 3.22). These, together with Mahoning County's nine schools, four each in Summit and Trumbull counties, three in Lake, two in Lorain, and one each in Ashtabula, Portage and Richland counties, totaled 53 schools each with 500-999 students. According to the national library standards, these schools needed at least $750 to $1,500 annually for books.[1] Table 3.23 shows that 33 schools each spent $2,000 or more, and that 52 schools had at least $1,500. Twelve of the 56 schools in Cuyahoga County reported budgets between $1,500 and $2,000, and eleven others claimed budgets of $500 to $1,000. Three schools had less than $500, and four schools did not report any budget figures. Cuyahoga County provided not only the largest number of schools in North Eastern Ohio but it also included schools of every size, and statistically, all apparently met the national minimum standards for budgets although further information was sought.

An attempt was next made to learn why some libraries had greater budget problems than others, and what effect, if any, trained library personnel had on the determination of budgets for printed materials. Four tables of data were prepared especially for this purpose. All of them had one factor in common in that they included only schools having a professional librarian for 20 or more hours each week. For example, Table 3.24 includes 10 counties with 11 schools, all of which were in 100-499 category of enrollment. Two city schools, six local, and three

---

[1] A.L.A. Committee on Post-War Planning, School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow, op. cit., p. 41.

TABLE 3.24

HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE 100-499 CATEGORY AND STAFFED BY PROFESSIONAL
LIBRARIANS, ARRANGED BY COUNTIES TO ILLUSTRATE
DIFFERENCES IN BUDGETS, 1956

| County | Name of School | Organization | | | Budget for Materials |
|--------|----------------|------|-------|-------------|----------------------|
| | | City | Local | Ex. Village | |
| Cuyahoga[a] | Cleveland Trade(West) | X | | | $ 1,100 |
| Erie[a] | Vermilion High | | X | | 2,600 |
| Geauga[a] | West Geauga High | | X | | 1,000 |
| Hamilton | St. Bernard High | X | | | 800 |
| | Elmwood Place High | | | X | 500 |
| Holmes | Nashville High | | X | | 400 |
| Huron | Monroeville High | | X | | 750 |
| Lake[a] | Mentor High | | | X | 2,000 |
| Mercer | St. Henry Local High | | X | | 350 |
| Morgan | Marion Local High | | X | | 350 |
| Portage[a] | Windham High | | | X | 1,500 |
| Total 10 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 3 | High ––– $2,600<br>Low –– $ 350<br>Range–– $2,250<br>Mean ––– $1,032<br>Per<br>Pupil–– $3.44 |

[a]In North Eastern Ohio.

exempted village schools comprised this group. Certain other schools
reported professional librarians but failed to indicate the amount of
weekly time given to library duty. Schools having professional librarians,
but which did not give data on the budget were also omitted. Among the
counties, only Hamilton County had two schools; one city, and the other
exempted village. The largest budget was $2,600 for Vermilion High School

in Erie County, a local school in North Eastern Ohio; the lowest figure
was $350, which was reported by two schools outside of the North Eastern
Ohio area, in Mercer and Morgan counties. Both were local schools. Of
the eleven small schools, five were in North Eastern Ohio. The mean of
$1,032, or $3.44 per pupil, was more than double that of the minimum
specified in the national standards. It should be noted that one school
in this category had reported a general library budget of $6,000,[1] but
that figure incorporated the salary for the librarian.

Table 3.25 includes 54 schools in 22 counties all in the 500-999
size category. Six of the counties were in North Eastern Ohio. Thirty-
eight were city schools; seven, local; and nine, exempted village.
Twenty-one schools, all in Cuyahoga County, included eighteen city
schools, while the others were located in exempted villages.

The two highest budgets reported were disregarded, since it seemed
obvious that the librarians' salaries were included and no response was
received from the letters of budget inquiry.[2] The smallest amount reported
was $400, well under the standard of $1.50 per pupil. The lowest budget
figure in Cuyahoga County was $690, also below the A.L.A. standards.
Because of their location, it could be assumed that certain schools had
few library resources apart from their own school facilities, and that
the standards would be far from adequate for such schools. The mean of
$1,532 indicated that the average budget for schools with 500-999 stu-
dents was $2.04 per pupil in 1956.

The data were not sufficiently detailed to warrant an analysis

_____

[1]Mentor High School, Lake County.

[2]Greenville High School, Darke County, $34,750, and Louisville
Public High School in Stark County, $23,860.

**TABLE 3.25**

HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE 500-999 CATEGORY STAFFED BY PROFESSIONAL
LIBRARIANS, ARRANGED BY COUNTIES TO ILLUSTRATE
DIFFERENCES IN BUDGETS, 1956

| County | Name of School | Organization | | | Budget for Materials |
| | | City | Local | Ex. Village | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Belmont | Bridgeport High | | | X | $ 500 |
| Clark | Hayward Junior High | X | | | 400 |
| Columbiana | Wellsville High | X | | | 500 |
| Cuyahoga[a] | Albert Bushnell Hart High | X | | | 1,200 |
| | Audubon Junior High | X | | | 2,295 |
| | Bay Village High | X | | | 2,545 |
| | Brooklyn High | X | | | 3,000 |
| | Central Junior High | X | | | 2,040 |
| | Charles F. Brush Memorial Junior High | X | | | 830 |
| | Emerson Junior High | X | | | 690 |
| | Euclid Central High | X | | | 3,893 |
| | Frank L. Wiley Junior High | X | | | 1,125 |
| | Glenville High | X | | | 1,500 |
| | Mayfield High | X | | | 1,110 |
| | Myron T. Herrick Junior High | X | | | 1,720 |
| | Nathan Hale Junior High | X | | | 2,000 |
| | Newton D. Baker | X | | | 3,100 |
| | Roxboro Junior High | X | | | 1,783 |
| | South High | X | | | 2,069 |
| | William Dean Howells High | X | | | 1,790 |
| | Wilson Junior High | X | | | 1,785 |
| | Cuyahoga Hts. High | | | X | 691 |
| | Orange High | | | X | 800 |
| | Warrensville Hts. High | | | X | 3,139 |
| Delaware | Willis High | X | | | 1,300 |
| Fairfield | Lancaster High | X | | | 1,200 |
| Franklin | Grandview Hts. High | X | | | 1,000 |
| | Grove City High | | | X | 3,000 |
| | Madison Local High | | X | | 3,800 |

TABLE 3.25—Continued

| County | Name of School | Organization | | | Budget for Materials |
|--------|----------------|:----:|:-----:|:-----------:|----:|
| | | City | Local | Ex. Village | |
| Hamilton | Mt. Healthy High | X. | | | $ 500 |
| | Madeira High | | | X | 2,950 |
| | Wyoming High | X | | | 1,200 |
| Hancock | Findlay Senior High | X | | | 600 |
| | J.C. Donnell Junior High | X | | | 800 |
| Hardin | Kenton High | X | | | 1,248 |
| Highland | Greenfield High | | | X | 610 |
| Huron | Norwalk High | X | | | 1,000 |
| Lorain[a] | Avon Lake High | | X | | 1,800 |
| Mahoning[a] | Chaney High | X | | | 860 |
| | North High | X | | | 943 |
| | Rayen High | X | | | 1,264 |
| | Struthers High | X | | | 1,316 |
| | Poland Seminary High | | X | | 2,000 |
| Miami | Piqua Central High | X | | | 1,750 |
| Montgomery | Washington Twp. High | | X | | 3,472 |
| Portage[a] | Roosevelt High | X | | | 1,000 |
| Stark | Canton South High | | X | | 1,500 |
| | Middlebranch High | | X | | 500 |
| | North Canton High | | | X | 1,000 |
| Summit[a] | South High | X | | | 420 |
| Trumbull[a] | Harry B. Turner Junior High | X | | | 470 |
| | Hubbard High | | | X | 1,000 |
| Tuscarawas | Dover High | X | | | 1,600 |
| Van Wert | Van Wert High | | X | | 2,100 |
| Total 22 | 54 | 38 | 7 | 9 | High —$3,893 Low — 400 Range — 3,493 Mean — 1,532 Per Pupil-$ 2.04 |

[a]In North Eastern Ohio.

of the relation of the size of budgets to particular factors, such as location or type of school. Other studies which would deal only with library budgets would doubtless be revealing and profitable.

Among the 44 schools with 1,000-1,999 enrollments, 23 were located in six counties of North Eastern Ohio, and 20 were situated in 16 other counties of the state (Table 3.26). All of the schools, except Clay High School in Lucas County, were in city districts. Clay was a local school and reported a budget of $15,315, the highest of all the schools in this category. A letter to the principal, followed by a conference, produced the figure for books and materials, $4,315, as shown in Table 3.26. The average budget for the larger schools was $1,747 or $1.16 per pupil, considerably less than the standards. The lowest amount, $691, was reported by Uhrichsville High School in Tuscarawas County. The minimum budget for this category should have been $1,500, with twice that amount for the maximum enrollment in this subdivision of size.

Table 3.27 contains ten of the largest schools all located in cities in four counties. Cuyahoga County's five city schools were the only ones located in North Eastern Ohio. The highest figure of $5,500 was, however, in Hamilton County, and the lowest came in Montgomery County. The mean was $3,141, or $1.57 per pupil, barely exceeding the $3,000 minimum for schools of this size.

Three budgets of $10,000 or more were also reported from Cuyahoga County. These were checked with the school financial offices to determine expenditures for materials. All three included personnel costs as did Mansfield Senior High School in Mahoning County. All of the corrected budget figures appear in Tables 3.24 to 3.27.

Summary Table 3.28 was constructed to illustrate the extremes in

TABLE 3.26

HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE 1,000-1,999 CATEGORY STAFFED BY PROFESSIONAL
LIBRARIANS, ARRANGED BY COUNTIES TO ILLUSTRATE
DIFFERENCES IN BUDGETS, 1956

| County | Name of School | Organization City | Other | Budget for Materials |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Allen | Central Junior High | X | | $ 1,925 |
| Butler | Hamilton High | X | | 2,250 |
| Cuyahoga[a] | East Technical High | X | | 4,450 |
| | Euclid Senior High | X | | 2,743 |
| | Garfield Heights High | X | | 1,300 |
| | James Ford Rhodes | X | | 2,200 |
| | John Hay High | X | | 1,580 |
| | Kennard Junior High | X | | 2,600 |
| | Maple Heights High | X | | 1,587 |
| | Parma Schaaf Junior High | X | | 1,504 |
| | Rawlings Junior High | X | | 2,360 |
| | Shaker Heights Senior High | X | | 1,720 |
| | Shore Junior High | X | | 2,822 |
| | Thomas Edison | X | | 1,500 |
| | W. H. Kirk Junior High | X | | 1,023 |
| Defiance | Defiance High | X | | 1,284 |
| Franklin | East High | X | | 1,544 |
| | South High | X | | 1,500 |
| | Upper Arlington High | X | | 4,062 |
| Hamilton | Norwood High | X | | 2,100 |
| Hardin | Patterson Cooperative High | X | | 1,248 |
| Licking | Newark Senior High | X | | 1,000 |
| Lorain[a] | Lorain High | X | | 2,000 |
| Lucas | Waite High | X | | 1,616 |
| | Woodward High | X | | 1,332 |
| | Clay High | | X[b] | 4,315 |
| Mahoning[a] | East High | X | | 1,384 |
| | Hayes Junior High | X | | 1,158 |
| | Woodrow Wilson High | X | | 1,330 |
| | South High | X | | 1,257 |
| Marion | Marion (Harding) High | X | | 1,485 |

TABLE 3.26--Continued

| County | Name of School | Organization | | Budget for Materials |
| | | City | Other | |
|--------|----------------|------|-------|----------------------|
| Montgomery | Colonel White High | X | | $ 1,296 |
| | Fairview High | X | | 1,277 |
| Richland[a] | John Simpson Junior High | X | | 1,250 |
| | Johnny Appleseed Junior High | X | | 1,250 |
| | Mansfield Senior High | X | | 1,500 |
| Sandusky | Ross High | X | | 1,600 |
| Scioto | Portsmouth High | X | | 1,500 |
| Seneca | Fostoria High | X | | 1,200 |
| Stark | Lincoln High | X | | 1,500 |
| Summit[a] | Central High | X | | 700 |
| Trumbull[a] | Warren G. Harding | X | | 1,789 |
| Tuscarawas | Uhrichsville High | X | | 691 |
| Wayne | Wooster High | X | | 1,150 |
| Total  22 | 44 | 43 | 1 | High $ 4,450<br>Low $ 691<br>Range $ 3,759<br>Mean $ 1,747<br>Per Pupil $ 1.16 |

[a]In North Eastern Ohio.

[b]A local school. None were in exempted villages.

budgetary allotments, and to bring together the medians of the different size categories of the schools having trained librarians. Of the 439 schools responding to the questionnaire, it became apparent that many schools had adequate budgets for their size, according to prevailing A.L.A. standards. Of course, this assumes that the report covered a representative year, and not, for example, the budget required to establish a new library. Among the schools, the areas outside of North Eastern——

TABLE 3.27

HIGH SCHOOLS OF 2,000 OR MORE STUDENTS STAFFED BY PROFESSIONAL
LIBRARIANS, ARRANGED BY COUNTIES TO ILLUSTRATE
DIFFERENCES IN BUDGETS, 1956

| County | Name of School | Organization | | Budget for Materials |
| | | City | Other[b] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cuyahoga[a] | John Adams High | X | | $ 2,135 |
| | John Marshall High | X | | 3,570 |
| | Lincoln High | X | | 3,235 |
| | Parma Senior High | X | | 2,121 |
| | Shaker Junior High | X | | 3,401 |
| Hamilton | Hughes High | X | | 4,150 |
| | Western Hills High | X | | 4,000 |
| | Withrow High | X | | 5,500 |
| Montgomery | Fairmont High | X | | 1,300 |
| Stark | McKinley High | X | | 2,000 |
| Total 4 | 10 | 10 | 0 | High $5,500 Low $1,300 Range $4,200 Mean $3,141 Per Pupil $1.57 |

[a]In North Eastern Ohio.

[b]All of the schools were in cities.

Ohio showed higher maximum budgets but lower minimums, with the exception
of the 100-499 group. Median budgets of all schools but one group met
the national standards. Schools with 1,000-1,999 students were lacking
approximately $750 each for reading materials. Schools with fewer than
100 students do not appear in Table 3.28 because none had professional
personnel for 20 or more hours each week.

The foregoing data demonstrate that better-staffed schools in
1956 had more adequate budgets than did the Ohio high school libraries
as a whole. This is especially significant since only twelve schools

## TABLE 3.28

### BUDGETS FOR HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES STAFFED WITH PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO AND IN OTHER COUNTIES, 1956

| Enrollment | Schools | | | | | | Budgets | | | | | | Per Pupil | Median | ALA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NEO | | Other | | Total | | High | | Low | | Range | | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | NEO | Other | NEO | Other | NEO | Other | | | |
| 2,000 & up | 5 | 7.8 | 5 | 9.0 | 10 | 8.4 | $3,750 | $5,500 | $2,121 | $1,300 | $1,449 | $4,200 | $1.57 | $3,235 | $3,000 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 23 | 36.0 | 21 | 38.2 | 44 | 37.0 | 4,450 | 4,062 | 700 | 691 | 3,750 | 3,371 | 1.16 | 1,500 | 2,250 |
| 500-999 | 31 | 48.4 | 23 | 41.8 | 54 | 45.4 | 3,893 | 3,800 | 420 | 400 | 3,473 | 3,400 | 2.04 | 1,248 | 1,125 |
| 100-499 | 5 | 7.8 | 6 | 10.9 | 11 | 9.2 | 2,600 | 800 | 1,000 | 350 | 1,600 | 450 | 3.44 | 800 | 450 |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | 55 | 99.9 | 119 | 100.0 | $4,450 | $5,500 | $ 420 | $ 350 | $3,750 | $5,080 | | | |

reported more than one trained librarian while the great need for more than one in schools with over 1,000 students has been shown. There were 44 schools in the 1,000-1,999 enrollment category and as many as 33 had only one librarian (Table 3.12). The expenditure for printed materials was based on the mean and compared to the median budgets. For the largest schools the mean dollar per pupil expenditure was calculated to be $1.57. The weakest budget of $1.16 per pupil expenditure was in schools with 1,000-1,999, where the median budget was also below A.L.A. standards. Better budgets were provided in schools with 500-999 students where $2.04 per student was spent in 1956. The best allocation was for the smallest group with under 500 students where $3.44 per pupil exceeded the minimum by nearly 230 per cent.

## Services

Seven specific library services were listed and defined in Form I, Part II, of the 1956 questionnaire, and librarians were asked to place a check mark in the column which best described the quality of service afforded by their school library. Columns were headed: A (Service extends beyond the minimum requirements), B (Service meets minimum needs), and C (Service is needed but is not offered). The seven specific services were:

I. Instructing in library usage: arrangement, location and use of all books and facilities including reference materials, card catalog and indexes.

II. Promoting worthy use of leisure time: providing material on historic buildings, current events, conducting hobby clubs, reading contests, inviting visitors to stimulate new interests for leisure time.

III. Enriching the curriculum: serving on curriculum committees, circulating curricula of other cities, helping with reading assignments.

IV. Centralizing instructional materials: audio-visual aids, specimens, mechanical devices as well as books, periodicals and pamphlets.

V. Cooperating with inservice training of teachers: displaying announcements of graduate courses, professional lectures, conventions and meetings, by directing professional publications to those particularly concerned.

VI. Cooperating with the promotion of the school program: audio-visual services, guidance and health services, reading improvement.

VII. Sharing in the cultural life of the community: assisting with civic projects, organizing parents' reading clubs, publicizing concerts, plays, lectures, and exhibits.

The responses were grouped into the five categories of enrollment size followed in the present chapter. The results are given in the next seven tables beginning with Table 3.29.

Each of the tables provides an average rating of the services as they were performed in schools of a particular size. Two points were assigned for those services checked as superior (A), and one point for each service checked as meeting the minimum requirements of the students and teachers (B). Although a school which checked Column C counted as one vote, no points were assigned because the service was either very weak or was not offered.

The formula used to determine the average rating was $\frac{X}{Y}$, in which X equaled the number of points (2 A+B), and Y equaled the number of votes (A+B+C). The number of points divided by the number of votes produced the average rating of the performance for each service, as well as a total numerical evaluation of the services in schools of various sizes. Each table shows the number of possible votes and the percentage of schools that rated the services as excellent, average, or poor. Horizontal totals appraise the quality of the service in a given enrollment category, and the final columns show the average rating and rank of each

TABLE 3.29

RATING BY LIBRARIANS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 13 SCHOOLS
WITH 2,000 STUDENTS, OR MORE, 1956

| Service[a] | A[b] Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 4 | 30.8 | 6 | 46.2 | 3 | 23.1 | | | 13 | 100.1 | 1.08 | 4 |
| II | 4 | 30.8 | 5 | 38.5 | 4 | 30.8 | | | 13 | 100.1 | 1.00 | 5 |
| III | 6 | 46.2 | 4 | 30.8 | 3 | 23.1 | | | 13 | 100.1 | 1.23 | 2 |
| IV | 1 | 7.7 | 6 | 46.2 | 4 | 30.8 | 2 | 15.4 | 13 | 100.1 | 0.73 | 7 |
| V | 6 | 46.2 | 5 | 38.5 | 2 | 15.4 | | | 13 | 100.1 | 1.31 | 1 |
| VI | 5 | 38.5 | 5 | 38.5 | 3 | 23.1 | | | 13 | 100.1 | 1.15 | 3 |
| VII | 2 | 15.4 | 2 | 15.4 | 4 | 30.8 | 5 | 38.5 | 13 | 100.1 | 0.75 | 6 |
| Total | 28 | 30.8 | 33 | 36.2 | 23 | 25.3 | 7 | 7.7 | 91 | 100.0 | 1.06 | |

[a]I, Instructing in use of library; II, Promoting worthy use of leisure time; III, Helping enrich the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Cooperating with inservice training of teachers; VI, Cooperating with the promotion of the school program; and VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community.

[b](A) The service extends beyond minimum requirements; (B) Service meets minimum needs; and (C) Service is needed but not offered.

service.

In 1956, the largest schools in Ohio rated service V, Cooperating with inservice training of teachers, as their best service, and IV, Centralizing instructional materials, they judged to be the least effective. There were more B ratings than either A or C, but among the thirteen schools with 2,000 or more students, 30.8 per cent of the library services extended beyond the minimum requirements. There was a total of 91 possible votes from this group of schools, and all but seven (7.7 per cent) of them appraised the service given (Table 3.29).

Fifty-nine schools with 1,000-1,999 students each were polled on the same seven services. Of these, 10.7 per cent of the votes were lost. It is interesting that the greatest number failed to check service IV (Table 3.30). Only 20.3 per cent of the librarians rated IV, Centralizing instructional materials, as A or superior, while 44.1 per cent rated the same service B, or as meeting minimum needs. Only 6.8 per cent rated it

TABLE 3.30

RATING BY LIBRARIANS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 59 SCHOOLS
WITH 1,000-1,999 STUDENTS, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 20 | 33.3 | 33 | 55.9 | 3 | 5.1 | 3 | 5.1 | 59 | 100.0 | 1.30 | 1 |
| II | 12 | 20.3 | 38 | 64.4 | 6 | 10.2 | 3 | 5.1 | 59 | 100.0 | 1.11 | 3 |
| III | 13 | 22.1 | 38 | 64.4 | 8 | 13.6 | | | 59 | 100.1 | 1.08 | 5.5 |
| IV | 12 | 20.3 | 26 | 44.1 | 4 | 6.8 | 17 | 28.8 | 59 | 100.0 | 1.03 | 5.5 |
| V | 17 | 28.8 | 33 | 55.9 | 5 | 8.5 | 4 | 6.8 | 59 | 100.0 | 1.09 | 4 |
| VI | 18 | 30.5 | 31 | 52.5 | 6 | 10.2 | 4 | 6.8 | 59 | 100.0 | 1.22 | 2 |
| VII | 7 | 11.9 | 29 | 49.2 | 12 | 20.3 | 11 | 18.6 | 59 | 100.0 | 0.90 | 7 |
| Total | 99 | 24.0 | 228 | 55.0 | 44 | 10.7 | 42 | 10.2 | 413 | 99.9 | 1.15 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

as needed but not offered. The centralization of audio-visual services apart from the library, in many school systems, undoubtedly made this aspect difficult for many to answer. Librarians would quite logically hesitate to indicate a strong preference for adding the responsibility to the library if they had little or no help to handle the work. Also,

the crowded quarters in some of the school libraries would doubtless necessitate modernization and expansion of the library to accommodate such extra services.

The favored service was I, Library instruction, with an average rating of 1.30. The poorest service was VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community, with an average rating of .90.

The same series of services was rated by the 123 schools with 500-999 students (Table 3.31). Centralizing instructional materials ranked lowest in these schools. The average rating was .88, and library instruction was again noted as the best service.

TABLE 3.31

RATING BY LIBRARIANS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 123 SCHOOLS
WITH 500-999 STUDENTS, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 43 | 35.0 | 55 | 44.7 | 15 | 12.2 | 10 | 8.1 | 123 | 100.0 | 1.25 | 1 |
| II | 15 | 12.2 | 68 | 55.3 | 8 | 6.5 | 32 | 26.0 | 123 | 100.0 | 1.08 | 4 |
| III | 28 | 22.8 | 62 | 50.4 | 21 | 17.1 | 12 | 9.8 | 123 | 100.1 | 1.06 | 5 |
| IV | 22 | 17.9 | 38 | 30.9 | 33 | 26.8 | 30 | 24.4 | 123 | 100.0 | 0.88 | 7 |
| V | 29 | 23.6 | 63 | 51.2 | 13 | 10.6 | 18 | 14.6 | 123 | 100.0 | 1.15 | 2 |
| VI | 32 | 26.0 | 57 | 46.3 | 22 | 17.9 | 12 | 9.8 | 123 | 100.0 | 1.09 | 3 |
| VII | 22 | 17.9 | 38 | 30.9 | 28 | 22.8 | 35 | 28.5 | 123 | 100.1 | 0.93 | 6 |
| Total | 191 | 22.2 | 381 | 44.3 | 140 | 16.3 | 149 | 17.3 | 861 | 100.1 | 1.07 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

The next table (Table 3.32) shows the evaluations by librarians

in 216 Ohio high schools in the 100-499 group. In this category, over 90 per cent of the 1,512 possible votes were cast. Again, the best service was felt to be I, Library instruction, and the lowest was VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community. It was also observed

TABLE 3.32

RATING BY LIBRARIANS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 216 SCHOOLS
WITH 100-499 STUDENTS, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 43 | 19.9 | 123 | 56.9 | 43 | 19.9 | 7 | 3.2 | 216 | 99.9 | 1.00 | 1 |
| II | 26 | 12.1 | 102 | 47.2 | 71 | 32.9 | 17 | 7.9 | 216 | 100.0 | 0.77 | 6 |
| III | 22 | 10.2 | 110 | 50.9 | 62 | 28.7 | 22 | 10.2 | 216 | 100.0 | 0.79 | 5 |
| IV | 41 | 19.0 | 79 | 36.6 | 61 | 28.2 | 35 | 16.0 | 216 | 99.8 | 0.89 | 3 |
| V | 32 | 14.8 | 115 | 53.2 | 52 | 24.1 | 17 | 7.8 | 216 | 99.9 | 0.90 | 2 |
| VI | 31 | 14.4 | 108 | 49.8 | 60 | 27.8 | 17 | 7.8 | 216 | 99.8 | 0.85 | 4 |
| VII | 39 | 18.1 | 59 | 27.3 | 87 | 40.3 | 31 | 14.4 | 216 | 100.1 | 0.74 | 7 |
| Total | 234 | 15.5 | 696 | 46.0 | 436 | 28.8 | 146 | 9.7 | 1512 | 100.0 | 0.85 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

that the total average rating of 0.85 was lower than for any group except the very smallest schools with less than 100 students (Table 3.33).

Only 12 schools of the latter size were included in this study and they seemed to experience difficulty in judging the quality of their library services. Three services each had the very low average rating of 0.58, and the highest rating was earned by service V, Cooperating with the inservice training of teachers.

TABLE 3.33

RATING BY LIBRARIANS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 12 SCHOOLS
WITH 0-99 STUDENTS, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | | | 7 | 58.4 | 5 | 41.7 | | | 12 | 100.1 | 0.58 | 6 |
| II | 2 | 16.7 | 7 | 58.4 | 3 | 25.0 | | | 12 | 100.1 | 0.92 | 2 |
| III | 1 | 8.3 | 5 | 41.7 | 6 | 50.0 | | | 12 | 100.0 | 0.58 | 6 |
| IV | 2 | 16.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 6 | 50.0 | | | 12 | 100.0 | 0.67 | 3 |
| V | 2 | 16.7 | 8 | 66.7 | 2 | 16.7 | | | 12 | 100.1 | 1.00 | 1 |
| VI | 2 | 16.7 | 3 | 25.0 | 7 | 58.3 | | | 12 | 100.0 | 0.58 | 6 |
| VII | 1 | 8.3 | 5 | 41.7 | 5 | 41.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 12 | 100.0 | 0.64 | 4 |
| Total | 10 | 11.9 | 39 | 46.4 | 34 | 40.5 | 1 | 1.2 | 84 | 100.0 | 0.71 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

Table 3.34 shows the ratings of 16 schools that did not report enrollments. The total average rating was the same as the average for schools with 500-999 students (Table 3.31), but there was no corresponding similarity in the ranking of the seven services. Among the 16 schools, service V, Cooperating with the inservice training of teachers ranked first with an average of 1.41, and the least effective service was felt to be IV, Centralizing instructional materials.

The final table in this sequence of tables showing the ratings as related to size of schools, provides a summary of the ratings by librarians of all of the 439 schools combined. There were 3,073 possible votes for the combined services. It is noteworthy that more than one-

TABLE 3.34

RATING BY LIBRARIANS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 16 SCHOOLS
WITH UNDISCLOSED ENROLLMENTS, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 2 | 12.5 | 7 | 43.7 | 3 | 18.7 | 4 | 25.0 | 16 | 99.9 | 0.92 | 6 |
| II | 2 | 12.5 | 8 | 50.0 | 2 | 12.5 | 4 | 25.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 1.00 | 5 |
| III | 4 | 25.0 | 6 | 37.5 | 2 | 12.5 | 4 | 25.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 1.17 | 2 |
| IV | 3 | 18.8 | 4 | 25.0 | 5 | 31.3 | 4 | 25.0 | 16 | 100.1 | 0.83 | 7 |
| V | 7 | 43.7 | 3 | 18.8 | 2 | 12.5 | 4 | 25.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 1.41 | 1 |
| VI | 3 | 18.8 | 7 | 43.7 | 2 | 12.5 | 4 | 25.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 1.03 | 4 |
| VII | 3 | 18.8 | 5 | 31.3 | 2 | 12.5 | 6 | 37.5 | 16 | 100.1 | 1.10 | 3 |
| Total | 24 | 21.4 | 40 | 35.7 | 18 | 16.1 | 30 | 26.8 | 112 | 100.0 | 1.07 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

fifth of the ratings indicated that the respective services were not even offered (Table 3.35).

The B ratings were the most common, showing that approximately half (46.1 per cent) of all services were judged to meet only the minimum requirements of the schools. Less than 20 per cent received A ratings and a slightly greater proportion (22.6 per cent) rated their services as needed but not afforded. Service II, Promoting worthy use of leisure time, received the smallest proportion of A ratings, and Service I, Instructing in use of the library, which ranked first, also had the highest proportion of A ratings.

Services IV and VII seemed to be the most difficult to rate. It

TABLE 3-35

SUMMARY TABLE OF RATINGS OF LIBRARIANS OF THE SEVEN LIBRARY
SERVICES; ALL SCHOOLS COMBINED, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 112 | 25.5 | 231 | 52.6 | 72 | 16.4 | 24 | 5.5 | 439 | 100.0 | 1.10 | 1 |
| II | 61 | 13.9 | 228 | 51.9 | 94 | 21.4 | 56 | 12.8 | 439 | 100.0 | 0.94 | 4 |
| III | 74 | 16.9 | 225 | 51.3 | 102 | 23.2 | 38 | 8.7 | 439 | 100.0 | 0.93 | 5 |
| IV | 81 | 18.5 | 157 | 35.8 | 113 | 25.7 | 88 | 20.0 | 439 | 100.0 | 0.91 | 6 |
| V | 93 | 21.2 | 227 | 51.7 | 76 | 17.3 | 43 | 9.8 | 439 | 100.0 | 1.04 | 2 |
| VI | 91 | 20.7 | 211 | 48.1 | 100 | 22.8 | 37 | 8.4 | 439 | 100.0 | 0.98 | 3 |
| VII | 74 | 16.9 | 138 | 31.4 | 138 | 31.4 | 89 | 20.3 | 439 | 100.0 | 0.82 | 7 |
| Total | 586 | 19.1 | 1417 | 46.1 | 695 | 22.6 | 375 | 12.2 | 3073 | 100.0 | 0.96 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

has already been established that most schools did not centralize their audio-visual services. How widespread the practice was of placing in the classrooms and laboratories reference or reading-improvement materials which were not cataloged in the general library collection could not be estimated from the data available, but the uncertainty seemed evident in the ratings. Many librarians did not seem to know what kind of organization was best for their schools.

It might be assumed that VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community, was not generally regarded as a service vital to a successful school library program. Nearly one-third of all the schools rated that service C, as not being given, and over 20 per cent more failed

to vote at all on that particular service.

The following four tables deal with the ratings of the seven services in libraries with professional personnel, both with and without clerical assistants, as well as libraries with sub-professional librarians with and without clerks. Points were assigned to weight the services as in the tables immediately preceding. Table 3-36 shows the ratings of 39 schools, all of which were staffed by at least one professional librarian and one clerk.

TABLE 3-36

RATINGS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 39 HIGH SCHOOLS OF
NORTH EASTERN OHIO, STAFFED BY PROFESSIONAL
LIBRARIANS WITH CLERICAL HELP, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 16 | 41.0 | 21 | 53.9 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 39 | 100.1 | 1.40 | 2 |
| II | 8 | 20.5 | 22 | 56.4 | 6 | 15.4 | 3 | 7.7 | 39 | 100.0 | 1.06 | 6 |
| III | 16 | 41.0 | 18 | 46.2 | 3 | 7.7 | 2 | 5.1 | 39 | 100.0 | 1.35 | 3 |
| IV | 6 | 15.4 | 18 | 46.2 | 5 | 12.8 | 10 | 25.6 | 39 | 100.0 | 1.03 | 7 |
| V | 18 | 46.2 | 18 | 46.2 | 2 | 5.1 | 1 | 2.6 | 39 | 100.1 | 1.42 | 1 |
| VI | 13 | 33.3 | 22 | 56.4 | 3 | 7.7 | 1 | 2.6 | 39 | 100.0 | 1.26 | 4 |
| VII | 6 | 15.4 | 21 | 53.8 | 3 | 7.7 | 9 | 23.1 | 39 | 100.0 | 1.10 | 5 |
| Total | 83 | 30.4 | 140 | 51.3 | 23 | 8.4 | 27 | 9.9 | 273 | 100.0 | 1.24 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

The total average rating for these schools was 1.24. The highest ranking service was V, Cooperating with the inservice training of the teachers (1.42). Following closely was service I, with an average rating

of 1.40. The poorest service in the schools with the professional li-
brarian and a clerk was IV, Centralizing instructional materials (1.03).

Almost the same proportion of schools in North Eastern Ohio were
staffed by a trained librarian working without clerical assistance
(Table 3.37).

TABLE 3.37

RATINGS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 38 HIGH SCHOOLS OF
NORTH EASTERN OHIO, STAFFED BY PROFESSIONAL
LIBRARIANS WITHOUT CLERICAL HELP, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 13 | 34.2 | 22 | 57.9 | 3 | 7.9 | | | 38 | 100.0 | 1.26 | 1 |
| II | 3 | 7.9 | 20 | 52.6 | 12 | 31.6 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 | 100.0 | 0.74 | 6 |
| III | 8 | 21.1 | 20 | 52.6 | 7 | 18.4 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 | 100.0 | 1.03 | 4 |
| IV | 6 | 15.8 | 14 | 36.8 | 10 | 26.3 | 8 | 21.1 | 38 | 100.0 | 0.87 | 5 |
| V | 11 | 29.0 | 18 | 47.4 | 4 | 10.5 | 5 | 13.2 | 38 | 100.1 | 1.21 | 2 |
| VI | 10 | 26.3 | 19 | 50.0 | 6 | 15.8 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 | 100.0 | 1.11 | 3 |
| VII | 3 | 7.9 | 14 | 36.8 | 12 | 31.6 | 9 | 23.7 | 38 | 100.0 | 0.69 | 7 |
| Total | 54 | 20.3 | 127 | 47.7 | 54 | 20.3 | 31 | 11.7 | 266 | 100.0 | 1.00 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enrich-
ing the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice
training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in
community life.

The average rating was 1.00 in contrast to 1.24 for the schools
that afforded clerical help. The best service among the schools where
the librarian performed all the duties either alone or with student help,
was library instruction, an indication that students had to locate li-
brary materials largely through their own efforts and were, therefore,
given careful instruction. The important point, however, was the

difference in average rating of the second best service in the schools
with a librarian and clerk (1.40, Table 3.36), and the highest average
rating of the best service in schools without clerical help (1.26,
Table 3.37).

Where sub-professional librarians were in charge of the school
library the services did not maintain as high an average rating as those
with professional leadership. In Table 3.38, the 11 schools where an
untrained librarian was aided by a clerk, the total point average was

TABLE 3.38

RATINGS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 11 HIGH SCHOOLS OF
NORTH EASTERN OHIO, STAFFED BY SUB-PROFESSIONAL
LIBRARIANS WITH CLERICAL HELP, 1956

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 3 | 27.3 | 6 | 54.6 | 2 | 18.2 | | | 11 | 100.1 | 1.09 | 2 |
| II | 2 | 18.2 | 6 | 54.6 | 2 | 18.2 | 1 | 9.1 | 11 | 100.1 | 1.00 | 4.5 |
| III | 2 | 18.2 | 7 | 63.6 | 2 | 18.2 | | | 11 | 100.0 | 1.00 | 4.5 |
| IV | 1 | 9.1 | 4 | 36.4 | 4 | 36.4 | 2 | 18.2 | 11 | 100.1 | 0.67 | 7 |
| V | 2 | 18.2 | 5 | 45.5 | 2 | 18.2 | 2 | 18.2 | 11 | 100.1 | 1.00 | 4.5 |
| VI | 4 | 36.4 | 2 | 18.2 | 4 | 36.4 | 1 | 9.1 | 11 | 100.1 | 1.00 | 4.5 |
| VII | 2 | 18.2 | 6 | 54.6 | 1 | 9.1 | 2 | 18.2 | 11 | 100.1 | 1.11 | 1 |
| Total | 16 | 20.8 | 36 | 46.8 | 17 | 22.1 | 8 | 10.4 | 77 | 100.1 | 0.99 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enrich-
ing the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice
training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in
community life.

0.99, and the best service was VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the
community. Since the sample was quite small, and 18.2 per cent of the
librarians did not respond to item VII, the number of negative votes for

service VII was less than if the librarians had known or admitted the service was not effective or was not offered. Library instruction ranked second highest, and Centralizing materials of instruction fell into seventh place.

The largest number of schools in any one of the four groups in the present series of tables was 47, the schools that were staffed by sub-professional librarians without clerical assistance. With this obvious weakness in staff it was understandable that the total average rating would be the lowest of the four categories studied (0.82, Table 3.39).

**TABLE 3.39**

**RATINGS OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN 47 HIGH SCHOOLS OF NORTH EASTERN OHIO, STAFFED BY SUB-PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS WITHOUT CLERICAL HELP, 1956**

| Service[a] | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 9 | 19.2 | 29 | 61.7 | 9 | 19.2 | | | 47 | 100.1 | 1.00 | 2 |
| II | 1 | 2.1 | 24 | 51.1 | 18 | 38.3 | 4 | 8.5 | 47 | 100.0 | 0.60 | 6 |
| III | 6 | 12.8 | 19 | 40.4 | 17 | 36.2 | 5 | 10.6 | 47 | 100.0 | 0.74 | 5 |
| IV | 9 | 19.2 | 19 | 40.4 | 13 | 27.7 | 6 | 12.8 | 47 | 100.1 | 0.90 | 3 |
| V | 8 | 17.0 | 30 | 63.8 | 6 | 12.8 | 3 | 6.4 | 47 | 100.0 | 1.05 | 1 |
| VI | 6 | 12.8 | 27 | 57.5 | 13 | 27.7 | 1 | 2.1 | 47 | 100.1 | 0.85 | 4 |
| VII | 4 | 8.5 | 14 | 29.8 | 22 | 46.8 | 7 | 14.9 | 47 | 100.0 | 0.55 | 7 |
| Total | 43 | 13.1 | 162 | 49.2 | 98 | 29.8 | 26 | 7.9 | 329 | 100.0 | 0.82 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

It is interesting that library instruction ranked second, as in the group preceding, and that the best service was V, Cooperating with the inservice training of the teachers. In line with the schools staffed by professional librarians, service VII was again rated as being the poorest.

From the foregoing data, it was evident that the best library services were performed in libraries having an adequate staff, qualified by training and assigned to work which they were professionally prepared to do. The total average ratings were highest in schools with professional librarians and clerks; second in those with professional librarians without clerks; third in libraries with sub-professional librarians without clerical assistance. The highest proportion of A ratings (30.4 per cent), as well as B ratings (51.3 per cent), occurred in schools with professional librarians and clerks (Table 3.36). The greatest weaknesses in services were revealed by the large proportion of C ratings (29.8 per cent) which occurred in schools with neither an adequately trained librarian nor a clerk (Table 3.39).

The best service among the schools in the thirteen counties in North Eastern Ohio was found to be Service V, Cooperating with the inservice training of teachers with a high average rating of 1.20 (Table 3.40). Library instruction, Service I, scored second with a competitive average of 1.19. It is interesting that Library instruction had the highest number of A ratings and only one non-voter.

The two weakest school library services in the same area were service II, Leisure time (0.81) and service VII, with 0.79, a lower rating than given for the state as a whole, which was 0.82. The schools in North Eastern Ohio had a slightly higher total point average on all

TABLE 3.40

SUMMARY TABLE OF RATINGS OF THE SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES[a] OF
NORTH EASTERN OHIO, ALL SCHOOLS COMBINED, 1956

| Service | A Ratings | | B Ratings | | C Ratings | | Unknown or N.R. | | Total | | Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| I | 41 | 30.4 | 78 | 57.8 | 15 | 11.1 | 1 | 0.7 | 135 | 100.0 | 1.19 | 2 |
| II | 14 | 10.4 | 72 | 53.3 | 38 | 28.3 | 11 | 8.1 | 135 | 100.1 | 0.81 | 6 |
| III | 32 | 23.7 | 64 | 47.4 | 29 | 21.5 | 10 | 7.4 | 135 | 100.0 | 1.02 | 4 |
| IV | 22 | 16.3 | 55 | 40.7 | 32 | 23.7 | 26 | 19.3 | 135 | 100.0 | 1.10 | 3 |
| V | 39 | 28.9 | 71 | 52.6 | 14 | 10.4 | 11 | 8.1 | 135 | 100.0 | 1.20 | 1 |
| VI | 33 | 24.4 | 70 | 51.8 | 26 | 19.3 | 6 | 4.4 | 135 | 99.9 | 1.00 | 5 |
| VII | 15 | 11.1 | 55 | 40.7 | 38 | 28.1 | 27 | 20.0 | 135 | 99.9 | 0.79 | 7 |
| Total | 196 | 20.7 | 465 | 49.2 | 192 | 20.3 | 92 | 9.7 | 945 | 99.2 | 1.00 | |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enrich-
ing the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice
training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in
community life.

services for its schools (1.00) than the schools in Ohio combined which
had 0.96. Moreover, all except three per cent of the schools in Ohio,
those with 2,000 or more students, rated higher on services in direct
relation to the size of the school (Table 3.41). Large schools with
1,000-1,999 scored 1.15 with the next best score 1.07 for schools with
500-999. Smaller enrollment categories, 100-499, had an average rating
of 0.85 and those under 100 had 0.71 rating. The same table shows the
ratings for North Eastern Ohio according to the qualifications of library
personnel. It should also be observed that the greatest percentage of
ratings (34.8 per cent) came from schools with neither a clerk nor a
professional librarian.

TABLE 3.41

TOTAL AVERAGE RATING OF SELECTED LIBRARY SERVICES[a] OF
OHIO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, 1956

| Enrollment Category | All Schools | | | Qualifications of Staff | Schools in NEO | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Average Ratings | No. | % | | Total Average Ratings | No. | % |
| 2,000 and up | 1.06 | 13 | 3.0 | Professional Librarian and Clerk | 1.24 | 39 | 28.9 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 1.15 | 59 | 13.4 | Professional Librarian and No Clerk | 1.00 | 38 | 28.1 |
| 500-999 | 1.07 | 123 | 28.0 | | | | |
| 100-499 | 0.85 | 216 | 49.2 | Non-professional Librarian and Clerk | 0.99 | 11 | 8.1 |
| 0-99 | 0.71 | 12 | 2.7 | Non-professional Librarian and No Clerk | 0.82 | 47 | 34.5 |
| Unknown | 1.07 | 16 | 3.6 | | | | |
| Total | 0.96 | 439 | 99.9 | Total | 1.00 | 135 | 99.9 |

[a]I, Library instruction; II, Worthy use of leisure; III, Enriching the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Inservice training of teachers; VI, Promoting the school program; VII, Sharing in community life.

In order to permit further examination of the ratings of the seven rated services, four tables were prepared with the data arranged according to the personnel complement reported for each group in each county. The schools were identified only by code numbers, and the exact rating of each of the seven services was shown. The four tables are shown in Appendix C. They are concerned with the responding schools in North Eastern Ohio in 1956. It was felt that superintendents, school library supervisors, accrediting agencies of the state, and the North Central Association might find such data valuable when conducting developmental

studies of these libraries.

The fact that librarians recognized the need to be more closely identified with the cultural life of the community is shown in the voluntary responses to the summary questions which followed the checklist of seven services. According to the librarians, the service most expertly performed was I, Instructing in library usage, and the service which was done least well was VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community. The difference is emphasized for North Eastern Ohio in Table 3.42, which contrasts the best and poorest performances. Over 40 per cent of all of the schools regarded library instruction as their best service, and 58.4 per cent of the schools in North Eastern Ohio felt that such instruction was their greatest contribution to the over-all library program in 1956.

Although Promoting worthy use of leisure time, service II, ranked second best among most of the schools, the percentage was only 10.7 per cent in contrast to 41.5 per cent for service I, Library instruction. It is interesting to note that 11.2 per cent of all schools also rated service II, Leisure, as its second poorest service. Enriching the curriculum, service III, was rated best by 10.5 per cent of all schools, but this service was more highly regarded among North Eastern Ohio schools where it ranked second only to Library instruction. It was surmized that school libraries in North Eastern Ohio were somewhat divided in their philosophy of providing for the leisure time of their students. Although 10.7 per cent of the schools in that area ranked the service 3.5 out of seven, a greater percentage of the schools (13.4 per cent) ranked that service as the second poorest (Table 3.42).

Services II, Use of leisure, and VI, Cooperating with the promotion of the school program, were ranked equally in North Eastern Ohio,

## TABLE 3.42

### LIBRARY SERVICES IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO AND IN OTHER COUNTIES AS RATED BY THE HEAD OF EACH SCHOOL LIBRARY, 1956

| Services | Best Performance | | | | | | Poorest Performance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NEO | | Other | | Combined | | NEO | | Other | | Combined | |
| | Rank | % | Rank | % | Rank | % | Rank | % | Rank | % | Rank | % |
| I Instructing in use of library | 1 | 58.4 | 1 | 32.8 | 1 | 41.5 | 4.5 | 7.4 | 7 | 3.8 | 5 | 5.0 |
| II Promoting worthy use of leisure time | 3.5 | 10.7 | 2 | 10.7 | 2 | 10.7 | 2 | 13.4 | 2 | 10.0 | 2 | 11.2 |
| III Enriching the curriculum | 2 | 12.1 | 3 | 9.7 | 3 | 10.5 | 6 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 4.1 | 6 | 4.6 |
| IV Centralizing instructional materials | 5 | 5.4 | 5 | 5.9 | 5 | 5.7 | 3 | 8.7 | 3 | 9.3 | 3 | 9.1 |
| V Cooperating with inservice training of teachers | 6 | 0.7 | 6 | 2.1 | 6 | 1.6 | 4.5 | 7.4 | 4 | 6.6 | 4 | 6.8 |
| VI Cooperating with the promotion of the school program | 3.5 | 10.7 | 4 | 6.9 | 4 | 8.2 | 7 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 4.1 | 7 | 3.4 |
| VII Sharing in cultural life of the community | 7 | | 7 | 1.4 | 7 | 0.9 | 1 | 30.9 | 1 | 29.3 | 1 | 29.8 |
| No Response | | 2.0 | | 30.7 | | 21.0 | | 24.8 | | 32.8 | | 30.1 |
| Total | | 100.0 | | 100.2 | | 100.1 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | 100.0 |

but the latter ranked near to the bottom in other parts of the state. Service VI ranked last. Centralizing instructional materials, service IV, ranked fifth among the best services but nearly 10 per cent of all schools rated it as being their third-poorest service. A more reliable statistical estimate was obtained by assigning points to the A and B votes.

Some discrepancy between Total Average Ratings in Tables 3.35 and 3.40 and the ranks of best performance in Table 3.42 was anticipated since several A ratings could not possibly reveal which of the "A" services was best. Two different facts have been established: (1) Table 3.35 shows the average ratings for the group as a whole, and Table 3.40 shows ratings in North Eastern Ohio; (2) Table 3.42 shows the percentage of schools that regarded each service as the best and which service was best in the greatest number of schools. Therefore, more schools gave good service in V Cooperating with inservice training of teachers (1.04), but 10.7 per cent of the schools regarded service II, Promoting worthy use of leisure time, as their best service, and three-fourths as many specified Library instruction as the outstanding service performed. One-fifth did not indicate which service was best and almost one-third did not specify the most neglected service.

The greatest similarity between the schools of North Eastern Ohio and the state as a whole was found in relation to studies or evaluations. While 45.2 per cent of the other counties had evaluated their school library services, 46.3 per cent of the counties in North Eastern Ohio in 1956 had rated their school libraries within the past three years (Table 3.43). These data indicated a marked similarity in patterns of evaluation and the corresponding need for greater concentration on the

TABLE 3.43

HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED DURING THE PAST THREE YEARS IN THIRTEEN COUNTIES OF NORTH EASTERN OHIO AND IN OTHER COUNTIES, 1956

| County | Recently Evaluated | | | Not Evaluated | | No Response | | Schools Surveyed | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | Rank | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | Rank |
| Lake | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 1 | 16.6 | | | 6 | 99.9 | 9.5 |
| Geauga | 3 | 75.0 | 2 | 1 | 25.0 | | | 4 | 100.0 | 12 |
| Summit | 7 | 58.3 | 3 | 2 | 16.7 | 3 | 25.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 3 |
| Portage | 4 | 57.2 | 4 | 3 | 42.9 | | | 7 | 100.1 | 7 |
| Ashtabula | 5 | 55.5 | 5.5 | | | 4 | 44.4 | 9 | 99.9 | 5.5 |
| Trumbull | 5 | 55.5 | 5.5 | 3 | 33.3 | 1 | 11.1 | 9 | 99.9 | 5.5 |
| Ashland | 1 | 50.0 | 8 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 13 |
| Erie | 3 | 50.0 | 8 | | | 2 | 33.3 | 6 | 100.0 | 9.5 |
| Medina | 3 | 50.0 | 8 | 3 | 50.0 | | | 6 | 100.0 | 9.5 |
| Lorain | 4 | 40.0 | 10 | 5 | 50.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 4 |
| Cuyahoga | 21 | 37.5 | 11.5 | 30 | 53.6 | 5 | 8.9 | 56 | 100.0 | 1 |
| Mahoning | 6 | 37.5 | 11.5 | 10 | 62.5 | | | 16 | 100.0 | 2 |
| Richland | 2 | 33.3 | 13 | 4 | 66.7 | | | 6 | 100.0 | 9.5 |
| NEO | 69 | 46.3 | 1 | 63 | 42.3 | 17 | 11.4 | 149 | 100.0 | 2 |
| Other Counties | 131 | 45.2 | 2 | 126 | 43.4 | 33 | 11.4 | 290 | 100.0 | 1 |
| Total | 200 | 45.5 | | 189 | 43.1 | 50 | 11.4 | 439 | 100.0 | |

maintenance and development of library services.

## Summary and Conclusions

The principal aim of the present chapter was to identify and evaluate Ohio High School Library services in 1956 and to record the quantitative changes observed in organization, materials, and personnel since the Nolan report of 1949.[1]

Although the greatest interest in the survey was elicited from schools in North Eastern Ohio, over 32 per cent from outside of that area responded to the checklist questionnaire. In all, 439 schools replied.

A greater proportion of city schools in North Eastern Ohio were represented, and nearly 73 per cent of the junior high school replies were from schools in that area.

Unfortunately, there were no earlier records with which to compare the percentage of students that used the school libraries in 1956. It was learned, however, that the greatest use occurred in the smaller schools; in fact, the pattern of use was found to be in inverse proportion to the enrollment. Nearly all school librarians reported limited use by teachers, but a negligible number reported that all the teachers used the service.

Schools were found to be miles apart in many areas, and problems of transportation undoubtedly made it impractical to expect widespread use of the school library before or after classes. Only 60 per cent of the libraries were open before and after school, and virtually none had evening hours; moreover, many libraries offered only partial service during the school day (43.1 per cent).

---

[1]Nolan and Herrick, op. cit.

Storage space was lacking in over half of the libraries and less than two-fifths had workrooms. About three-fourths had suitable furnishings and less than half had enough space for all of its library functions.

More of the schools had better-stocked libraries than they had in 1948, but at least one-third needed more books. Over 80 per cent met the standards for periodicals having a minimum of 15-29 subscriptions, but only two-thirds had access to Readers' Guide and only one out of five schools had 10 to 19 subscriptions which were indexed. Audio-visual materials were circulated by one-fifth of the libraries, and 37.6 per cent borrowed from other libraries. One out of ten borrowed specimens from museums.

More than half of the schools had budgets for books and other printed materials and supplies which ranged between $500 and $2,000, but none of the very small schools reported a budget as large as $2,000. Cuyahoga County schools had the largest budgets, but no other county had a school with more than 2,000 students. It was ascertained that budgets were generally adequate in schools staffed with trained librarians. Budgets for schools of different sizes that had a professional librarian at least 20 hours each week were studied in various size-groups. Schools with 100-499 students spent $3.44 per pupil; schools with 500-999 spent $2.04; those with 2,000 or more students barely met the standards with $1.57 per pupil, and only the group with 1,000-1,999 spent $1.16 per pupil, less than the standards recommended.

The best service of the Ohio high school libraries was Library instruction. According to the point system employed, 1.10 was the highest total average rating, while 0.82 was the lowest. The latter was for service VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community. Cooperating

with the inservice training of teachers, service V, ranked second with a
score of 1.04, followed by service VI, Cooperating with the promotion of
the school program (0.98), II, Promoting worthy use of leisure time (0.94),
III, Helping enrich the curriculum (0.93), and IV, Centralizing instruc-
tional materials (0.91). The highest total average points were observed
among the schools having both a professional librarian and a clerk (1.24);
next, by a professional librarian alone (1.00); third, by schools having
a clerical assistant with a sub-professional librarian (0.99); and the
poorest average by schools having a sub-professional librarian (0.82).

Schools remained below standard in personnel, but by 1956, 86 of
the 439 school (19.6 per cent) had at least one professional librarian,
and 12 (2.7 per cent) schools had more than one.

School libraries were staffed with personnel with varying degrees
of training, and more than 20 per cent had no library science training
at all. Slightly more than one-third of the schools had trained librar-
ians. The total number that met the A.L.A. standards for professional
staff in 1956 was calculated to be 60.9 per cent. Only 13.7 per cent of
the schools met the standards for clerical personnel for the library.
In North Eastern Ohio about one-third of the libraries had clerks, and
over half of them had trained librarians.

Student assistants were generally assigned to help with library
duties. Schools with 1,000-1,999 students had an average of 20 per
school, and the greatest number, and the fewest were found in the schools
with under 100 enrolled. In 1956, the median for Ohio was 10.3 student
assistants per school. Their duties were not defined, but it was assumed
that more often than not their function was largely clerical, considering
the few schools that employed adults for that type of library service.

Less than half of all of the school libraries had been evaluated
during the past three years and the average for North Eastern Ohio was
approximately the same as for the other counties surveyed. The best
evaluation report came from Lake County, where 83.3 per cent of the
schools had made recent studies. In Cuyahoga County, 37.5 per cent of
the libraries had been studied within the three-year period and ranked
11.5 among the thirteen counties.

CHAPTER IV

OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN 1963

## Introduction

The most recent data on Ohio's public high school libraries, obtained for the present study during the school year, 1963-1964, are summarized in the present chapter which is limited to the area of North Eastern Ohio. It consists of three parts. Part I, High School Library Facilities and Services, attempts to interpret the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the high schools that participated in the survey of 1956. The majority of the schools also completed supplementary evaluations of their libraries which are treated in Part II, High School Libraries Evaluated by A.L.A. Standards. Part III, Library Trends in Newer High Schools, describes the major findings in high schools which did not appear in the 1955-1956 Ohio Educational Directory, but which were listed in the same source in 1962-1963.

## Part I. High School Library Facilities and Services

In the late fall of 1963, 149 high school principals in North Eastern Ohio reviewed various aspects of their library services in order to help them interpret the needs of their own school, to intensify their interest in library excellence, and to up-date their information gained in the 1956 survey, reported in Chapter III.

All types of public high schools in the thirteen counties

132

comprising North Eastern Ohio were surveyed.[1] Among the 92 city schools, 47.8 per cent replied, while 49 per cent of the 51 local schools, and 40 per cent of the six exempted village schools answered the questionnaire. In all, 71 schools, or approximately half of the total, responded (Table 4.1).

TABLE 4.1

SOURCES OF 1963 DATA ON PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES[a]

| Description | Replied | | Schools No Response | | Total Surveyed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| **Type of District** | | | | | | |
| City | 44 | 47.8 | 48 | 52.2 | 92 | 100.0 |
| Local | 25 | 49.0 | 26 | 51.0 | 51 | 100.0 |
| Exempted Village | 2 | 40.0 | 4 | 60.0 | 6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 71 | 47.7 | 78 | 52.3 | 149 | 100.0 |
| **Type of School** | | | | | | |
| JHS | 22 | 51.2 | 21 | 48.8 | 43 | 100.0 |
| J-SHS | 49 | 46.2 | 57 | 53.8 | 106 | 100.0 |
| Total | 71 | 47.7 | 78 | 52.3 | 149 | 100.0 |
| **Size of School** | | | | | | |
| 2,000-3,999 | 10 | 14.0 | 6 | 7.7 | 16 | 10.7 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 30 | 42.3 | 24 | 30.8 | 54 | 36.2 |
| 500-999 | 25 | 35.2 | 27 | 34.6 | 52 | 34.9 |
| 0-499 | 6 | 8.5 | 21 | 26.9 | 27 | 18.1 |
| Total | 71 | 100.0 | 78 | 100.0 | 149 | 99.9 |

[a]Form II was mailed to 149 schools in the thirteen counties of North Eastern Ohio in October, 1963. A copy of Form II and the mailing list may be found in Appendix B.

The sizable response was attributed largely to the recognized need for more complete and modern data on Ohio school libraries, as well as the widespread concern of school men for the establishment, maintenance, and improvement of adequate libraries as bases for quality education.

_____

[1]Form II was mailed to 149 schools in North Eastern Ohio, October 28, 1963. A copy of Form II and the mailing list may be found in Appendix B.

More than three-fourths of the replies came from schools with enrollments from 500 to 2,000, while less than 10 per cent of the responses were from smaller schools, and only 14 per cent came from schools having more than 2,000 students. Although all counties were represented, 50.7 per cent of the responses came from Cuyahoga County (Table 4.2). The only enrollment group in other counties which matched Cuyahoga County was the

TABLE 4.2

RESPONSES FROM SCHOOLS BY SIZE AND COUNTIES, 1963

| County | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000-3,999 | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 0-499 | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Ashland | | | | | 1 | 4.0 | | | 1 | 1.4 |
| Ashtabula | | | 1 | 3.3 | | | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Cuyahoga | 8 | 80.0 | 16 | 53.3 | 11 | 44.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 36 | 50.7 |
| Erie | | | | | 2 | 8.0 | | | 2 | 2.8 |
| Geauga | | | | | 1 | 4.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Lake | | | 2 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.0 | | | 4 | 5.6 |
| Lorain | | | | | 1 | 4.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Mahoning | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 6 | 8.5 |
| Medina | | | 1 | 3.3 | 1 | 4.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Portage | | | 2 | 6.7 | | | | | 2 | 2.8 |
| Richland | | | 3 | 10.0 | 1 | 4.0 | | | 4 | 5.6 |
| Summit | | | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 4.0 | | | 3 | 4.2 |
| Trumbull | 1 | 10.0 | 1 | 3.3 | 2 | 8.0 | | | 4 | 5.6 |
| Total | 10 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.2 | 71 | 99.8 |

smallest category consisting of six schools with less than 100 students.

The following data on many of the aspects of library services were arranged by counties so as to preserve the individuality of the schools, especially in areas outside of the larger urban districts.

One aspect which did not change greatly from one county to another was that of enrollment. Table 4.3 shows that two-thirds of the schools

TABLE 4.3

PREDICTED GAIN IN ENROLLMENTS AMONG SCHOOLS OF NORTH EASTERN OHIO

| Per Cent of Gain | 1956-1963 | | 1963-1970[a] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of Schools | % | No. of Schools | % |
| 150-250 | 1 | 1.4 | | |
| 125-149 | 1 | 1.4 | | |
| 100-124 | 7 | 9.9 | 5 | 7.0 |
| 90-99 | 1 | 1.4 | | |
| 80-89 | 2 | 2.8 | | |
| 70-79 | 3 | 4.2 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 60-69 | 3 | 4.2 | 4 | 5.6 |
| 50-59 | 5 | 7.0 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 40-49 | 1 | 1.4 | 4 | 5.6 |
| 30-39 | 5 | 7.0 | 7 | 9.9 |
| 20-29 | 10 | 14.0 | 13 | 18.3 |
| 10-19 | 4 | 5.6 | 5 | 7.0 |
| 1-9 | 5 | 7.0 | 4 | 5.6 |
| 0 | 6[b] | 8.5 | 9 | 12.7 |
| No Response | 17 | 23.9 | 18 | 25.4 |
| Total | 71 | 99.7 | 71 | 99.9 |

[a]Estimate made by schools.

[b]Loss reported in two schools of Cuyahoga County.

had increases in school population during the intervening eight years. One school, however, had more than 150 per cent, although the largest number had between 20 and 29 per cent. Six schools actually had fewer students and several of the newer schools were unable to report compara-tive figures. Table 4.3 also shows the prediction of population gain between 1963 and 1970. Approximately one-fourth of the schools did not answer the question concerning expected growth, and 12.7 per cent reported no expected increase.

No direct relationship between the size of the school and the

quality of its library services was discernible, hence the principals
were asked to judge their library's general adequacy. The questionnaire
did not refer to the standards. The purpose was to obtain the candid
appraisal of libraries by a large group of principals. Table 4.4 ranks
the counties according to the percentage of the principals reporting
adequate libraries; libraries that met the needs of the individual schools.
It is surprising that less than one-third rated their library as adequate.

TABLE 4.4

ADEQUACY OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES RANKED BY RATINGS OF
PRINCIPALS IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO, 1963

| County | Rank | Adequate | | Inadequate | | No Response | | Combined | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Erie | 1 | 2 | 100.0 | | | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Geauga | 3 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Richland | 3 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | | | 4 | 100.0 |
| Lorain | 3 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Mahoning | 5 | 2 | 40.0 | 4 | 60.0 | | | 6 | 100.0 |
| Cuyahoga | 6 | 12 | 33.3 | 20 | 55.6 | 4 | 11.1 | 36 | 100.0 |
| Lake | 7.5 | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | | | 4 | 100.0 |
| Trumbull | 7.5 | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | | | 4 | 100.0 |
| Medina | 9.5 | | | 3 | 100.0 | | | 3 | 100.0 |
| Summit | 9.5 | | | 3 | 100.0 | | | 3 | 100.0 |
| Ashtabula | 12.5 | | | 2 | 100.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Portage | 12.5 | | | 2 | 100.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Ashland | 13 | | | 1 | 100.0 | | | 1 | 100.0 |
| Total Number of Schools | | 22 | 31.0 | 45 | 63.4 | 4 | 5.6 | 71 | 100.0 |

Table 4.5 summarizes four reasons why the principals' ratings were "less
than adequate."

Approximately half of the principals complained about poor facili-
ties and equipment, and over one-third regarded the lack of books and
related materials as the second greatest fault. Only 22.5 per cent

TABLE 4.5

REASONS GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS FOR INADEQUATE HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES IN
NORTH EASTERN OHIO, BY COUNTY, 1963

| County | Poor Facilities and Equipment | | Lack of Books and Related Materials | | Shortage of Personnel | | Insufficient Funds | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. of Schools |
| Ashland | 1 | 100.0 | | | | | | | 1 |
| Ashtabula | 2 | 100.0 | | | | | 2 | 100.0 | 2 |
| Cuyahoga | 17 | 47.2 | 6 | 16.7 | 11 | 30.6 | 4 | 11.1 | 36 |
| Erie | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Geauga | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | | | 2 |
| Lake | | | 3 | 75.0 | | | | | 4 |
| Lorain | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Mahoning | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 50.0 | 6 |
| Medina | 3 | 100.0 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | | | 3 |
| Portage | 2 | 100.0 | 1 | 50.0 | | | | | 2 |
| Richland | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | | | | | 4 |
| Summit | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | | | | | 3 |
| Trumbull | 3 | 75.0 | 2 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 25.0 | 4 |
| Total | 36 | 50.7[a] | 24 | 33.8[a] | 16 | 22.5[a] | 8 | 11.3[a] | 71 |

[a] Total percentages based upon 71 schools.

considered the shortage of personnel as a handicap, although several mentioned lack of staff time. Insufficient funds were mentioned only by about one principal in each ten, but in each case, accompanying poor facilities also contribute to the inadequacy. More than half of the schools reporting insufficient funds also reported shortage of library staff. One aspect not mentioned by the principals related to the lack of trained staff for classifying and cataloging materials, a time-consuming duty.

Less than one-fifth (18.3 per cent) of the high school principals pointed out characteristics of their libraries which accounted for satisfactory services. Adequate space ranked first, followed by good books and related materials, qualified personnel, and assessment of changing needs. Unfortunately, however, the sample seemed too small to warrant tabulation.

The relationship between the shortcomings of present libraries and the recommendations of the principals may be readily noted in Table 4.6.

Changes in facilities and equipment will be needed by 57.8 per cent of the schools, with 18.3 per cent needing new housing, and 28.2 per cent enlarged quarters. Additional shelving and seating space were mentioned by a lesser percentage, but enlarged facilities would undoubtedly require more equipment.

Although Table 4.6 shows the need of 22.5 per cent of the schools for more materials, and 21 per cent for added staff, by 1970, it is inconsistent that only 14 per cent voiced the need for a larger budget. Although the schools may think of capital expense as being unrelated to operating budgets, it would seem unlikely that current budgets would be

adequate in 1970 if all of the needs were met.

**TABLE 4.6**

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR IMPROVING
LIBRARY SERVICES**

| Aspect of Services | Number of Schools | Per Cent[a] |
|---|---|---|
| **A. Facilities and Equipment** | | |
| 1. Enlarge quarters | 20 | 28.2 |
| 2. New building | 13 | 18.3 |
| 3. Add shelving, seating space, expand equipment | 7 | 9.9 |
| 4. Extend hours | 1 | 1.4 |
| Total | 41 | 57.8 |
| **B. Books and Related Materials** | | |
| 1. Expand book collection | 13 | 18.3 |
| 2. Establish materials center | 3 | 4.2 |
| Total | 16 | 22.5 |
| **C. Personnel** | | |
| 1. Additional staff | 10 | 14.0 |
| 2. Clerical help | 5 | 7.0 |
| Total | 15 | 21.0 |
| **D. Funds** | | |
| 1. Larger budget | 10 | 14.0 |
| Total | 10 | 14.0 |

[a]Percentages based upon 71 responding schools.

Only one principal suggested that library hours should be extended. Although over 40 per cent of the schools were open more than 40 hours a week (Table 4.7), and more than 25 per cent of them had a librarian on duty beyond the 40-hour period, more than one-fourth of the schools were open 35 hours or less each week, and approximately two-thirds had a librarian on duty for more than 35 hours a week (Table 4.7).

As noted in Table 4.8, over one-third of the principals voted for longer hours, and almost 10 per cent said that a change in hours was

TABLE 4.7

HOURS OF LIBRARY SERVICE IN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
OF NORTH EASTERN OHIO, 1963

| Hours Open per Week | Schools | | Hours Open with Librarian | Schools | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | | No. | % |
| 46-49 | 2 | 2.8 | 46-49 | 2 | 2.8 |
| 41-45 | 28 | 39.4 | 41-45 | 16 | 22.5 |
| 36-40 | 22 | 31.0 | 36-40 | 29 | 40.8 |
| 31-35 | 13 | 18.3 | 31-35 | 13 | 18.3 |
| 26-30 | 2 | 2.8 | 26-30 | 5 | 7.0 |
| 21-25 | 2 | 2.8 | 21-25 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 16-20 | | | 16-20 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 11-15 | | | 11-15 | | |
| 6-10 | 2 | 2.8 | 6-10 | 3 | 4.2 |
| 1-5 | | | 1-5 | | |
| 0 | | | 0 | 1 | 1.4 |
| Total | 71 | 99.9 | Total | 71 | 99.8 |

TABLE 4.8

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL HOURS OF LIBRARY SERVICE, ACCORDING TO
HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, 1963

| School Library Hours | Number of Schools | Per Cent |
|---|---|---|
| Need to be extended | 26 | 36.6 |
| Current library hours satisfactory | 21 | 29.6 |
| Changes in hours contemplated | 7 | 9.9 |
| No opinion expressed | 17 | 23.9 |
| Total | 71 | 100.0 |

being contemplated. This apparent need for extended hours was not among
the four major shortcomings volunteered by the principals (Table 4.5).
Table 4.8 also shows that 29.6 per cent were satisfied with the present
hours, and 23.9 per cent did not express an opinion on the subject.

When asked the reasons for voting for or against opening the
school library evenings, on Saturday, or during the summer, 26 principals
volunteered eight different reasons why more hours were needed, and pro-
posed five reasons why the hours did not need to extend beyond the school
day (Table 4.9).

TABLE 4.9

OPINIONS OF PRINCIPALS RELATIVE TO OPENING LIBRARIES
DURING EVENINGS, SATURDAYS, AND SUMMERS

| Reasons | Schools | |
|---|---|---|
| | No. | % |
| A. Why more hours are needed: | | |
| 1. Summer classes | 10 | 38.5 |
| 2. Night classes | 6 | 23.1 |
| 3. Lack of time during the day | 4 | 15.4 |
| 4. Curriculum expansion | 2 | 7.7 |
| 5. Inadequate public library | 1 | 3.8 |
| 6. Inaccessible public library | 1 | 3.8 |
| 7. To stretch limited materials | 1 | 3.8 |
| 8. For processing books | 1 | 3.8 |
| Total | 26 | 99.9 |
| B. Why more hours are not needed: | | |
| 1. Proximity of public library | 15 | 71.4 |
| 2. School building closed | 3 | 14.3 |
| 3. After-school activities | 1 | 4.8 |
| 4. Arrangement of building not suitable | 1 | 4.8 |
| 5. Reference materials circulated overnight | 1 | 4.8 |
| Total | 21 | 100.1 |
| C. Other: | | |
| 1. Additional hours being considered | 7 | 29.2 |
| 2. Undecided | 4 | 16.7 |
| 3. No response | 13 | 54.2 |
| Total | 24 | 100.1 |

Of the 26 schools recommending longer hours, about one-third
felt that they needed more time to serve summer school classes, and 23.1
per cent mentioned night classes. Only four schools thought the students

had too little time during the day to use the library. Two interesting reasons for additional library hours were related to a public library. One school principal thought that the public library was inadequate, and another said that it was inaccessible. Had the question been asked more directly, more schools would doubtless have commented on the adequacy or inadequacy of the public library. In fact, 71.4 per cent of the 21 schools not needing expansion mentioned the proximity of the public library (Table 4.9).

The Standards recommend that the school library be open "at least one-half hour before classes begin and at least one hour after classes end."[1] In junior and senior high schools, the library should be open until five o'clock, or longer if the community has no public library. The Standards further encourage being open on Saturdays and at night.[2] It was obvious that some schools, especially those remote from a good public library, realized the importance of library services outside of class time, but the provision of public or school library services in the evenings, on Saturdays or throughout the summers was not widespread, nor did it seem to be a concern inasmuch as less than half of the schools felt a need to change their present policy (Table 4.8). Moreover, the majority of the school libraries were open no more than 40 hours a week; barely enough for the most meager service (Table 4.7). It is conceivable that many students were not finding sufficient school time to use the library.

The school demands upon public libraries in Ohio have not yet

[1] American Library Association, Standards for School Library Programs, op. cit., p. 88.

[2] Ibid.

been fully determined. The present study, however, attempts to estimate
the use of the public library by students, and certain aspects of the
interrelationships of school and public libraries. All educators should
be aware that objective number six, one of the nine major objectives of
the school library program, directly concerns the need for supplementary
services of the public library.

> Introduce pupils to community libraries as early as possible and
> co-operate with those libraries in their efforts to encourage
> continuing education and cultural growth.[1]

The objective implies that the bond between the different kinds of li-
braries should be strengthened through mutual efforts to provide coordi-
nated services. In communities where the public library is inadequate
or inaccessible, the burden on the school is often too great. On the
other hand, the danger of dependence of schools upon the public library
to the extent that the development of school library services are
retarded is hazardous and unsound.

## Instructional Materials Center

In the standards for school libraries the term "instructional
materials center" was incorporated in order to describe the modern li-
brary. The idea was adopted at the business meeting of the American As-
sociation of School Librarians in 1956:

> The American Association of School Librarians believes that the
> school library, in addition to doing its vital work of individual
> reading guidance and development of the school curriculum, should
> serve the school as a center for instructional materials. In-
> structional materials include books - the literature of children,
> young people and adults - other printed materials, films, record-
> ings, and newer media developed to aid learning. . . . Histori-
> cally, libraries of all types have been established to provide
> convenient centers for books and reading and for locating ideas

---

[1]Ibid., p. 9.

and information important to the communities they serve. The
interest a modern school now has in finding and using good
motion pictures, sound recordings, filmstrips and other newer
materials simply challenges and gives increased dimension to
established library roles.[1]

The above paragraph identifies the term and its origin, and an official

statement expands the definition:

In addition to tangible media, the concept of "instructional
materials" includes such community resources as individuals who
can make a significant contribution and the use of first hand
experiences in the field. All instructional materials now
available, and others yet to come, are needed to secure effec-
tive and efficient utilization of educational facilities and
teaching personnel. . . . There is no basic competition among
instructional materials. The point is that in any situation the
distinctive characteristics of each medium should be recognized
and all appropriate materials should be used.[2]

Wide acceptance and implementation of the materials center con-

cept were indicated in Lohrer's preliminary report of the study conducted

by the Graduate Library School of the University of Illinois under Title

VII of the National Defense Education Act. Lohrer found that independent

school systems were leading the way and that the larger cities tended to

be more conservative. She also observed that providing further services

was the greatest interest of the staff members.[3]

Concentration of large school districts in North Eastern Ohio

---

[1]Ibid., p. 11.

[2]Official statement of the Joint A.A.S.L.-A.C.R.L.-D.A.V.I Com-
mittee, approved in 1958 by the executive boards of the participating
organizations; i.e., American Association of School Librarians and the
Association of College and Research Librarians of A.L.A., the Department
of Audio-Visual Instruction of the N.E.A., in A.L.A. Standards, op. cit.,
pp. 59-62.

[3]Alice Lohrer, The School Library as a Materials Center; Educa-
tional Needs of Librarians and Teachers in Its Administration and Use.
Proceedings of a Conference under the Auspices of the U.S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, May 16-
18, 1962. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. 20402.

partially explains the slow development of the material center idea. The high school principals, for one reason or another, did not regard their libraries as centers for all of the school's materials of instruction. Of the 44 city schools, and 25 local schools, that reported on that issue, only five, or a mere 7 per cent, had high school libraries functioning as instructional materials centers in 1963 (Table 4.10).

### TABLE 4.10

#### HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES FUNCTIONING AS INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTERS, 1963

| County | Library--An Instructional Materials Center | Type of District | | | Enrollment[a] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | City | Local | Ex. Village | I | II | III | IV |
| Cuyahoga | Shaker Heights High School[b] Shaker Heights, Ohio | X | | | | | X | |
| Geauga | Newbury High School Newbury, Ohio | | X | | X | | | |
| Richland | Lexington High School Lexington, Ohio | | X | | | X | | |
| Summit | South High School Akron, Ohio | X | | | | | X | |
| | Tallmadge High School Tallmadge, Ohio | X | | | | X | | |
| Material Centers No. % [c] | 5 7.0 | 3 4.2 | 2 2.8 | 0 0.0 | 1 1.4 | 2 2.8 | 2 2.8 | 0 0.0 |
| Total School Replies No. % | 71 100.0 | 44 62.0 | 25 35.2 | 2 2.8 | 6 8.5 | 25 35.2 | 30 42.3 | 10 14.0 |

[a](I) 0-499 students; (II) 500-999 students; (III) 1,000-1,999 students; (IV) 2,000-3,000 students. All schools were J-SHS.

[b]Although Shaker Heights High School reported excellent facilities, it was observed that reference materials were not available in the school library.

[c]Percentages based upon 71 schools.

It will be recalled that many of the schools lacked space for all educational functions; therefore it may be assumed that space was also limited for audio-visual or non-reading materials. Only 17 schools (less than 25 per cent) reported the number of square feet of library space they required for such materials. Six schools, in four different counties, allowed from 101 to 300 square feet (Table 4.11). The wide

TABLE 4.11

LIBRARY SPACE ALLOTTED TO NON-READING MATERIALS[a] IN NINE OHIO COUNTIES, 1963

| County | 3-30 | | 31-100 | | 101-300 | | 301-500 | | 501-600 | | Combined | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Cuyahoga | 1 | 20.0 | | | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 50.0 | 5 | 29.4 |
| Richland | | | 1 | 100.0 | 2 | 33.3 | | | | | 3 | 17.6 |
| Mahoning | | | | | | | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 11.8 |
| Geauga | 2 | 40.0 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 11.8 |
| Lake | | | | | | | 1 | 33.3 | | | 1 | 5.9 |
| Summit | | | | | 1 | 16.7 | | | | | 1 | 5.9 |
| Trumbull | | | | | 1 | 16.7 | | | | | 1 | 5.9 |
| Erie | 1 | 20.0 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 5.9 |
| Medina | 1 | 20.0 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 5.9 |
| Total | 5 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 3 | 99.9 | 2 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.1 |

[a]Materials of instruction not ordinarily regarded as reading materials include recordings, pictures, slides, films and filmstrips, globes, maps, charts, and other newer media.

range, from three square feet to 600 square feet for non-reading materials, may be explained in part by the general practice of employing separate audio-visual departments, as well as the use of public library resources. The schools ranged in size from 2,966 to 420 students, and the median was 192 square feet. Table 4.12 provides coded identification of specific schools for those who might wish to inquire further into the matter. It

TABLE 4.12

**SPACE DEVOTED TO NON-READING MATERIALS IN HIGH SCHOOL
LIBRARIES OF VARIOUS SIZES, 1963**

| | Enrollment | Space for Non-Reading Materials | | Code No. of School[a] | County |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rank | Number of Students | Square Feet | Rank | | |
| 1 | 2,966 | 500 | 3 | 372 | Cuyahoga |
| 2 | 2,430 | 600 | 2 | 12 | Mahoning |
| 3 | 2,200 | 200 | 8 | 18 | Cuyahoga |
| 4 | 1,838 | 144 | 10 | 74 | Richland |
| 5 | 1,810 | 4 | 16 | 226 | Medina |
| 6 | 1,340 | 80 | 12 | 131 | Richland |
| 7 | 1,246 | 400 | 4 | 303 | Lake |
| 8 | 1,233 | 550 | 2 | 370 | Cuyahoga |
| 9 | 1,116 | 192[b] | 9 | 15 | Trumbull |
| 10 | 1,112 | 108 | 11 | 124 | Summit |
| 11 | 1,050 | 250 | 6 | 266 | Cuyahoga |
| 12 | 1,015 | 225 | 7 | 59 | Richland |
| 13 | 943 | 300 | 5 | 339 | Mahoning |
| 14 | 914 | 3 | 17 | 46 | Geauga |
| 15 | 798 | 20 | 14 | 142 | Cuyahoga |
| 16 | 763 | 60 | 13 | 53 | Erie |
| 17 | 420 | 10 | 15 | 11 | Geauga |

[a]Names of individual schools may be found in the October, 1963, mailing list, Appendix F.

[b]Median.

should be noted that one school library in Mahoning County, which did not claim a materials center, allowed 50 square feet more for non-reading materials than did the next ranking school known to have an outstanding example of a modern instructional materials center.[1] It is also interesting that one of the other five schools serving as a materials' center required only ten square feet of floor space, and that still another did

[1]Shaker Heights High School--Cuyahoga County.

not answer the question.

One of the school systems in Cuyahoga County submitted a report of its efforts toward a materials center to serve its growing community of nearly 2,000 students.[1] The estimated enrollment in 1970 was 3,500. Although the study does not attempt to describe all of the efforts of Beachwood for a materials center, the superintendent notes the contractual services provided by the County Library, namely: (1) to provide resources, and to conduct meetings to facilitate the selection of books; (2) to place orders for books, magazines and pamphlets selected by the school librarian; (3) to analyze, classify and catalog books ordered from County lists; (4) to mend local school library books and to handle those to be commercially bound; (5) to lend large quantities of books from the regional collection for periods of three months; (6) to lend audio-visual materials; (7) to assist with reference services for special materials; (8) to consult with administrators and teachers on plans and equipment of the school library, the book selection, coordination of the library with the curriculum, and other activities.

The Beachwood report listed five major activities needed for a functioning materials center: (1) reading, listening to recorded materials, and viewing projected pictures and films by both students and faculty members singly or in groups; (2) acquiring, organizing and housing materials for ready accessibility; (3) servicing and repairing materials and equipment; (4) teacher and pupil production of teaching aides such as graphs, charts, feltboard materials, slides, simple models, sound tapes, etc.; and (5) organizing of locally-produced closed-circuit television

---

[1]Beachwood Local School District, "Project Materials Center" (unpublished, not dated).

lessons.

Principals in North Eastern Ohio are presently not inclined to campaign for regional library centers. Although the concept is well expressed in the Standards,[1] the negative response may imply that the need is not felt to be sufficient, or is not realized. It is possible that many of the school libraries have contracts for service, or other cooperative arrangements, which are presently more satisfactory. Table 4.13 shows the outstanding negative vote which appeared in all of the counties.

TABLE 4.13

DISTRICTS WHICH RECOMMEND REGIONAL LIBRARY CENTERS

| County | Schools | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Recommend Center | | Do Not Recommend Center | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Ashland | | | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| Ashtabula | | | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Cuyahoga | 3 | 8.3 | 33 | 91.7 | 36 | 100.0 |
| Erie | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Geauga | | | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Lake | | | 4 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Lorain | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Mahoning | | | 6 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 |
| Medina | | | 3 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Portage | | | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Richland | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Summit | | | 3 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Trumbull | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Total Number of Schools | 7 | 9.9 | 64 | 90.1 | 71 | 100.0 |

In fact, only two counties, Erie and Lorain, voted equally for and against the issue, while Richland and Trumbull counties cast a three-to-one vote

---

[1]A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs, pp. 112-113.

against regional library centers. Only one school in ten was interested in the regional plan.

Among the 71 schools surveyed, only three did not furnish an estimate of the percentage of their students that used the school library. Many attached notes giving circulation statistics per day, or the approximate daily use. Table 4.14 attempts to translate the mixed data into useful percentages. The data, however, failed to reveal the optimum size

TABLE 4.14

USE OF LIBRARIES ACCORDING TO SIZE OF SCHOOL

| Enrollment | Use by Students | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 100% | | 50%-99% | | 25%-49% | | Under 25% | | Unknown | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 2,000-3,999 | 1 | 8.3 | 7 | 14.9 | | | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 | 10 | 14.0 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 6 | 50.0 | 18 | 38.3 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | | | 30 | 42.3 |
| 500-999 | 5 | 41.7 | 17 | 36.2 | 1 | 16.7 | | | 2 | 66.7 | 25 | 35.2 |
| 0-499 | | | 5 | 10.6 | 1 | 16.7 | | | | | 6 | 8.5 |
| Total | 12 | 16.9 | 47 | 66.2 | 6 | 8.5 | 3 | 4.2 | 3 | 4.2 | 71 | 100.0 |

of school. The best use of school libraries seemed to occur in schools with enrollments of 1,000 to 1,999 students, and the next best was in schools with 500 to 999. A majority of the schools in all size-categories reported one-half to 99 per cent usage by their students. On the other hand, two-thirds of the schools reporting very poor use were in the same category as the school reporting the greatest use. The size of the school, therefore, did not seem to be a controlling factor, although it would seem that larger schools would have many advantages that smaller schools could not provide.

A majority of the principals were able to estimate the percentage

of their enrollment that used the public library for school assignments (Table 4.15). It seemed more meaningful to present the facts by counties because it would facilitate identification of the areas needing the greatest improvement. Moreover, it was felt that objective data on fundamental needs would be more convincing to taxpayers than would the mere presentation of goals or standards.

The present study found that almost one-third (29.6 per cent) of the students in North Eastern Ohio were very uncertain about the use of public library facilities. The areas of greatest uncertainty consisted of Summit, Portage, and Cuyahoga counties. In three other counties, 5.6 per cent of the schools reported that more than three-fourths of their students used the public library for school-related purposes (Table 4.15). The only counties reporting heavy usage were Medina, where one-third of the schools depended upon the public library for school references; Trumbull, where one-fourth of the schools were evidently in very short supply of school library materials; and Cuyahoga County, where only 5.6 per cent of the schools reported heavy use of public library facilities for school assignments.

Considering North Eastern Ohio as a whole, 23.9 per cent of the high schools said that more than one-fourth, but less than one-half of their students went to the public library for school purposes. Ashtabula, Erie, and Richland counties had the greatest percentages.

In Ashland and Geauga counties, the public libraries served less than 10 per cent of the students. Although it might be assumed that the school libraries in these counties had appropriate materials, it is also probable that the needs of some students were not being adequately met from either source.

## TABLE 4.15

### STUDENT USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY COUNTIES, ACCORDING TO PRINCIPALS, 1963

| County | Per Cent of Enrollment Using Public Libraries for School Assignments | | | | | | | | | | | | Total Number of Schools | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 75%-100% | | 50%-74% | | 25%-49% | | 10%-24% | | Under 10% | | Unknown | | | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Ashland | | | | | | | | | 1 | 100.0 | | | 1 | 100.0 |
| Ashtabula | | | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | | | | | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Cuyahoga | 2 | 5.6 | 6 | 16.7 | 9 | 25.0 | 2 | 5.6 | 2 | 5.6 | 15 | 41.7 | 36 | 100.2 |
| Erie | | | | | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | | | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Geauga | | | | | | | | | 2 | 100.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Lake | | | 1 | 25.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | | | | | 4 | 100.0 |
| Lorain | | | | | | | 2 | 100.0 | | | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Mahoning | | | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 3 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 16.7 | 6 | 100.1 |
| Medina | 1 | 33.3 | | | 1 | 33.3 | | | | | 1 | 33.3 | 3 | 99.9 |
| Portage | | | | | | | 1 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Richland | | | | | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 25.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Summit | | | | | | | 1 | 33.3 | | | 2 | 66.7 | 3 | 100.0 |
| Trumbull | 1 | 25.0 | | | 2 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 25.0 | | | 4 | 100.0 |
| Combined | 4 | 5.6 | 9 | 12.7 | 17 | 23.9 | 14 | 19.7 | 6 | 8.5 | 21 | 29.6 | 71 | 100.0 |

Other libraries doubtless help high school students with their school work. For example, college and university libraries apparently serve some of the students in every county (Table 4.16), although almost half of the principals could not tell how many. A few schools, however, estimated that 10 per cent or more of their students used a college library, and one Medina school believed that one-third of the students did so. All of the schools in Geauga County, and half of the schools in Ashtabula and Lorain counties, reported from 5 to 9 per cent of the students used college libraries.

Another clue to the effectiveness of the school library is found in the interest shown by the teachers. The data showed that 75.5 per cent of the teachers, to some extent, use the school libraries (Table 4.17). More than one-fourth of the principals said that 71 to 80 per cent of the faculty used the school library, although in 7 per cent of the schools less than 10 per cent of the teachers did so. Table 4.18, which compares the teachers' use of the school library with that of the public library, shows that the teachers made better use of the public library. Although the use of school libraries seems generally good, there seems to be an apathy on the part of some schools to provide ample professional materials for the teachers. The preference of teachers for public libraries, and the lack of time during the school day to use the school's services, may help to explain the situation. Whatever the reason may be over half of the teachers use public libraries more, while one-fourth make greater use of the library in the school.

If the libraries of Ohio should decide to adopt modern, cooperative objectives with respect to library services, this would be an area which might profit greatly.

TABLE 4.16

STUDENT USE OF COLLEGE LIBRARY FACILITIES, ACCORDING TO PRINCIPALS, 1963

| County | Per Cent of Students Using College Libraries for School Assignments | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10% and Over | | 5%-9% | | 1%-4% | | None | | Unknown | | Total Schools | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Ashland | | | | | 1 | 100.0 | | | | | 1 | 100.0 |
| Ashtabula | | | 1 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 50.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Cuyahoga | 1 | 2.8 | 2 | 5.6 | 4 | 11.1 | 5 | 13.9 | 24 | 66.7 | 36 | 100.1 |
| Erie | | | | | | | 2 | 100.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Geauga | | | 2 | 100.0 | | | | | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Lake | | | | | 2 | 50.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Lorain | | | 1 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 50.0 | | | 2 | 100.0 |
| Mahoning | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 6 | 100.1 |
| Medina | 1 | 33.3 | | | | | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 | 3 | 99.9 |
| Portage | | | | | 1 | 50.0 | | | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Richland | | | 1 | 25.0 | | | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Summit | | | | | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 | 3 | 99.9 |
| Trumbull | | | 1 | 25.0 | | | 3 | 75.0 | | | 4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 3 | 4.2 | 9 | 12.7 | 10 | 14.0 | 17 | 23.9 | 32 | 45.1 | 71 | 99.9 |

TABLE 4.17

SCHOOL LIBRARY SERVICE TO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS
1963

| Per Cent of Teachers | Number of Schools | Per Cent | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| 91-100 | 12 | 16.9 | 2 |
| 81-90 | 9 | 12.7 | 4 |
| 71-80 | 18 | 25.4 | 1 |
| 61-70 | 4 | 5.6 | 6.5 |
| 51-60 | 2 | 2.8 | 10 |
| 41-50 | 10 | 14.0 | 3 |
| 31-40 | 3 | 4.2 | 8.5 |
| 21-30 | 4 | 5.6 | 6.5 |
| 11-20 | 1 | 1.4 | 11 |
| 0-10 | 5 | 7.0 | 5 |
| Unknown | 3 | 4.2 | 8.5 |
| Total | 71 | 99.8 | |

TABLE 4.18

TEACHERS' USE OF SCHOOL AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES, 1963

| Type of Library | Use by Teachers | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Optimum | | Insufficient | | Total | |
| | No. of Schools | % | No. of Schools | % | No. of Schools | % |
| School | 18 | 25.4 | 53 | 74.6 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Public | 36 | 50.7 | 35 | 49.3 | 71 | 100.0 |

It would benefit most teachers to acquire greater knowledge of public library materials, not only in their own areas of subject specialization, but in all of the arts and the many phases of cultural development. Although the school librarian is expected to possess a broad knowledge of materials, the best school library collections tend to be selected with the cooperation of the teachers; hence they reflect the teachers' cultural

and professional viewpoints. The public library affords ready access to a wide array of diverse and special media such as books, other printed materials, recordings, films, and microforms. Instruction of teachers in the use of the newer media of communications would encourage wiser selection and use of the materials for school libraries. The responsibility of the school librarian to the teachers can hardly be under estimated. The National Education Association (N.E.A.) found that only 13.1 per cent of 1,448 teachers, surveyed in 1958, were professionally trained in the role and function of the school library. A resolution was passed by the A.A.S.L. in 1960, and a similar one by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the N.E.A., to promote competency in the use of library resources in all teacher education programs.[1] Although such measures reach the grass roots of the problem, many teachers obviously need more library assistance than they are presently receiving. Librarians therefore should expend greater effort in assisting teachers to learn about and use the library resources of the school.

### Personnel

It has been shown in an earlier part of the study, dealing with 1956, that the qualifications of the personnel had a direct bearing upon the effectiveness of the school library services. Although many characteristics of a qualitative nature must not be overlooked or minimized, one of the more tangible measurements concerns the number of trained librarians on the staff. It was noted that the number of librarians needed is determined, to a degree, by the number of students to be served

---

[1] Elizabeth O. Williams, _Journal of Teacher Education_ (March, 1961), pp. 104-105. Reference made to Research Monograph 1958-MJ, "The Secondary-School Teacher and Library Services."

and by their training in the effective use of the library.

The *Standards* are more specific regarding the quantity of librar-
ians needed for schools than they are about their professional prepara-
tion. For the first 900 students, or fraction thereof, the Standards
recommend one librarian for each 300 students. For each additional 400
students, one full-time librarian is recommended.[1] On this basis, Table
4.19 points to a gross shortage of librarians in well over half of the
schools in North Eastern Ohio, in 1963.

TABLE 4.19

PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES, 1963

| Professional Librarian[a] FTE | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000-3,999 | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 0-499 | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| One full-time librarian | 9 | 90.0 | 26 | 86.7 | 18 | 72.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 54 | 76.1 |
| Less than 1.0 librarian | | | 3 | 10.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 11 | 15.5 |
| One librarian hired for each 300 students | 1 | 10.0 | 1 | 3.3 | 2 | 8.0 | 2 | 33.3 | 6 | 8.5 |
| Total No. of Schools | 10 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 71 | 100.1 |

[a]Minimum of 30 semester hours of library science is required.
A.L.A., Standards for School Library Programs, 1960.

All of the schools with more than 500 students needed more
trained librarians than were available. Less than one tenth (8.5 per
cent) of the schools hired a librarian with at least 30 semester hours

[1]A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 25.

of training beyond the Bachelor's Degree. In order to validate these data, the principals were asked regarding the need for more librarians, specifically on the basis of one for each 300 students. Table 4.20 shows that 80.3 per cent needed more than one librarian per school. Moreover, according to the principals, less than one-fifth of the schools in North Eastern Ohio could get along effectively with only one trained librarian.

TABLE 4.20

LIBRARIANS NEEDED, ACCORDING TO HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, 1963

| Librarians Needed Full Time | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000-3,999 | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 0-499 | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 1.0 per school | | | 6 | 20.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 14 | 19.7 |
| More than 1.0 per school | 10 | 100.0 | 24 | 80.0 | 20 | 80.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 57 | 80.3 |
| Total No. Surveyed | 10 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 71 | 100.0 |

Undoubtedly, in many schools other persons were attempting to do the work of a trained librarian. It is not the purpose of the present study to define the educational preparation required for school librarians. Even the National Standards are very broad, and quite vague on this point. In Ohio schools, librarians are expected to have a special certificate from the State Department of Education. The same basic education is required for any certified teacher except that the librarian must have a minimum of 30 semester hours in library science as specified in Laws and Regulations.[1]

---

[1] E. E. Holt and Albert C. May, Laws and Regulations Governing the Certification of Teachers, Administrators, and Supervisors and School Employees in Personnel Service, State of Ohio, Department of Education, Columbus, effective January 1, 1963, pp. 20, 21, 28-31.

The North Central Association has another provision. If the li-
brarian is regarded as a supervisor, the Master's Degree is required
with special preparation in subject-matter area.[1] This would imply that
all librarians may not be required to have the same training as the head
librarian who, in effect, serves as the library supervisor in the school.

The need for additional trained librarians has become common in
almost all fields of library endeavor, but schools have the greatest
need of all. A national survey in 1962 showed that 92,400 school librar-
ians were needed in addition to the 19,400 currently employed. Public
libraries needed 8,500, and college and university libraries required
2,500 more.[2] Suggestions for alleviating the shortage of trained librar-
ians are legion. Recruitment, internship, and inservice training have
been widely employed. Of course, more training schools are needed, and
teachers should be encouraged to know more about the materials to help
them with team teaching and independent study programs.

Ersted compiled a list of forty of the non-professional jobs
which should be performed by paid adult clerical help.[3] Some of the
duties required greater organizational ability while others needed some
degree of manual dexterity. As the clerical staff grows, the work should
be divided and the personnel selected and compensated according to the

[1]The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools,
Policies and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools (1963-64),
pp. 13-14.

[2]Wilbur J. Cohen and John G. Lorenz, Library Services. Health,
Education and Welfare Indicators. December, 1962. Library Services
Branch, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and
Welfare, p. vii.

[3]Ruth M. Ersted, Minnesota State Supervisor of School Libraries,
"Some Non-Professional Jobs in the School Library," SLDP, American Asso-
ciation of School Libraries, Chicago, Illinois, March, 1962, JN 25476.

job performed. The general categories include: (1) acquisition and me-
chanical preparation of materials, (2) cataloging and classification,
(3) circulation, (4) assistance to students and teachers, (5) physical
upkeep of material, (6) care of shelves and files, and (7) assisting
with reports.

According to National Standards, the average personnel require-
ment for Ohio school libraries, based upon the current student population,
was 5.2 trained librarians (Table 4.21) and 2.9 clerical assistants
(Table 4.22) per school.

<div align="center">TABLE 4.21</div>

<div align="center">LIBRARIANS NEEDED IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF NORTH EASTERN
OHIO, 1963, BASED UPON A.L.A. STANDARDS[a]</div>

| Enrollment | Trained Librarians | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number per School[b] | School Surveyed | Total Required by Standards |
| 2,000-3,999 | 10.0 | 10 | 100 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 6.6 | 30 | 198 |
| 500-999 | 2.5 | 25 | 62.5 |
| 0-499 | 1.0 | 6 | 6 |
| Combined | Mean 5.2 | 71 | 366.5 |

[a]A.A.S.L., Standards for School Library Programs, 1960.

[b]Based upon the midpoints of each enrollment category; i.e.,
3,000, 2,000, 750, and 200 students per school, with one full-time
librarian for each 300 students.

No attempt was made to determine the prevailing personnel com-
plement, but the opinions of the principals were convincing testimony
that Ohio high school libraries were understaffed. Table 4.23 illustrates
the shortage of clerical personnel in all but the largest schools where
80 per cent had sufficient clerical help. Only 40.8 per cent of all of

TABLE 4.22

CLERICAL PERSONNEL NEEDED IN SCHOOL LIBRARIES,
ACCORDING TO A.L.A. STANDARDS, 1963

| Enrollment | Clerks | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number per School (A.L.A.) | Number of Schools | Total |
| 2,000-3,999 | 5.0 | 10 | 50.0 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 2.5 | 30 | 75.0 |
| 500-999 | 1.3 | 25 | 32.5 |
| 0-499 | 1.0 | 6 | 6.0 |
| Combined | Mean 2.9 | 71 | 163.5 |

TABLE 4.23

NEED FOR CLERICAL ASSISTANTS IN LIBRARIES, ACCORDING TO
HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, 1963

| Enrollment | Clerical Personnel | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Adequate | | Inadequate | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 2,000-3,999 | 8 | 80.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 10 | 100.0 |
| 1,000-1,999 | 12 | 40.0 | 18 | 60.0 | 30 | 100.0 |
| 500-999 | 8 | 32.0 | 17 | 68.0 | 25 | 100.0 |
| 0-499 | 1 | 16.7 | 5 | 83.3 | 6 | 100.0 |
| Combined | 29 | 40.8 | 42 | 59.2 | 71 | 100.0 |

the schools had sufficient clerical staff to "permit the librarians to concentrate on professional services and activities without the need to devote large segments of their time to clerical and housekeeping duties."[1]

It would be not only interesting but highly beneficial to many

[1]A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 53.

schools if a list of duties, such as Ersted's were prepared by local high
school librarians to include professional, technical and clerical func-
tions. It would assist librarians when delegating time-consuming work,
and could serve in the preparation of job specifications for selecting
and training qualified staff for clerical and reference library service.

It may be assumed that schools depend widely upon students for
accomplishing numerous library details. Principals were asked to list
the duties performed by such student assistants, and which they felt
were educational. When librarians had no other source of assistance, it
is conceivable that such items as desk routine, mending books, reinforcing
magazines, filing and dictation were handled by students instead of by
paid clerical staff. Several schools noted that students were employed
as pages to shelve books and reinforce magazines. The duties as listed
in Table 4.24, however, were expected to contribute to the general edu-
cation of the students. Moreover, they were performed on a *volunteer*
basis. Filing, shelving, and desk routine ranked highest among the
twenty duties mentioned. It would appear that such duties as preparing
bibliographies, indexing, and displays might hold greater interest for
students, but these were among the least popular assignments.

> Volunteer student help in the library should never be exploited,
> and under no circumstances should it be used as a substitute
> for paid clerical assistance or janitorial work.[1]

## Book Collection

One of the major aspects of library service concerns the book
collection.[2] There was no feasible way to measure the adequacy of the

---

[1] A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

[2] Ibid., p. 76.

TABLE 4.24

LIBRARY DUTIES OF STUDENT ASSISTANTS, ACCORDING TO PRINCIPALS, 1963

| Duties | Performed by Students | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Schools | Per Cent[a] | Rank |
| Carding books | 3 | 4.2 | 10.5 |
| Cataloging | 4 | 5.6 | 7.5 |
| Checking attendance | 3 | 4.2 | 10.5 |
| Clerical (General) | 3 | 4.2 | 10.5 |
| Desk routine | 11 | 15.5 | 3 |
| Dictation | 2 | 2.8 | 14 |
| Displays | 2 | 2.8 | 14 |
| Filing | 21 | 28.2 | 1 |
| Handling films | 2 | 2.8 | 14 |
| Housekeeping | 1 | 1.4 | 18 |
| Indexing | 1 | 1.4 | 18 |
| Library Assistant (General) | 1 | 1.4 | 18 |
| Mending books | 4 | 5.6 | 7.5 |
| Messenger | 1 | 1.4 | 18 |
| Preparing bibliographies | 1 | 1.4 | 18 |
| Processing books | 3 | 4.2 | 10.5 |
| Reference--Assisting students | 6 | 8.5 | 5 |
| Reinforcing magazines | 5 | 7.0 | 6 |
| Shelving | 20 | 28.2 | 2 |
| Typing | 7 | 9.9 | 4 |

[a]Based upon the 71 schools reporting. Thirteen schools (18.3 per cent) do not have student library assistants.

book collections in Ohio high school libraries. One would need to know a great deal about the process of selection, weeding-out, the school's curriculum, the reading levels of the student body, etc. Gathering comparative information to up-date the surveys of 1948[1] and 1956 seemed to be the best procedure. It should be noted, however, that the size of

---

[1]Nolan, op. cit., pp. 220-221.

the minimum, recommended collections in schools having 200-999 students may vary from 6,000 to 10,000 books. For schools with 1,000 or more students, the requirement is ten books per student.[1]

Enrollment is a fair basis upon which to estimate the adequacy of the book collection, if the A.L.A. recommendations concerning general basic needs of the very small libraries are also kept in mind. Among the thirteen counties surveyed, Trumbull had the highest average per capita book collection, with 17.5 (Table 4.25). Half of Trumbull's schools had a mean of 32.5 books per pupil, and the other half, composed of one school in the 2,000-3,999 category, and one in the 1,000-1,999 classification, reported eleven and nine books per pupil, respectively. Summit County had the second highest mean of 16.2 books per pupil. The mean for all of the schools was 9.2 books per pupil, and the largest book collections, relative to enrollment, were found in schools with enrollments between 500-999. This was found in Ashland, Cuyahoga, Erie, Lake, Richland, Summit and Trumbull counties. It seems fair to conclude, therefore, that the older school libraries are situated in school buildings which were planned during an era when enough space was allowed for adequate book collections.

Five counties, namely, Ashland, Erie, Geauga, Mahoning, and Portage, reported that all of their high school libraries possessed adequate book collections; sufficient in content and quantity to meet the needs of students and teachers. These counties were, therefore, assigned the rating 100 per cent in Table 4.26.

The counties were readily ranked by size, but the ranking by percentages of schools in each county that reported adequate book

---

[1]A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 25.

## TABLE 4.25

### SIZE OF BOOK COLLECTIONS IN SCHOOLS OF VARIOUS SIZES, BY COUNTIES, 1963

| County | Books per Pupil | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000-3,999 | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 0-99 | | Total | | |
| | No. | Mean[a] | No. | Mean | No. | Mean | No. | Mean | No. | Mean | Rank |
| Ashland | | | | | 1 | 8.0 | | | 1 | 8.0 | 7 |
| Ashtabula | | | 1 | 2.5 | | | 1 | 9.0 | 2 | 5.8 | 11 |
| Cuyahoga | 8 | 5.8 | 16 | 8.0 | 11 | 12.2 | 1 | 5.0 | 36 | 7.8 | 8 |
| Erie | | | | | 2 | 11.5 | | | 2 | 11.5 | 3 |
| Geauga | | | | | 1 | 7.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 8.5 | 6 |
| Lake | | | 2 | 6.5 | 2 | 7.0 | | | 4 | 6.8 | 9 |
| Lorain | | | | | 1 | N.R. | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 10.0 | 5 |
| Mahoning | 1 | 5.0 | 2 | 3.0 | 2 | 7.5 | 1 | 16.0 | 6 | 10.5 | 4 |
| Medina | | | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 1 | 9.0 | 3 | 5.3 | 13 |
| Portage | | | 2 | 5.5 | | | | | 2 | 5.5 | 12 |
| Richland | | | 3 | 5.9 | 1 | 6.0 | | | 4 | 6.0 | 10 |
| Summit | | | 2 | 7.5 | 1 | 25.0 | | | 3 | 16.2 | 2 |
| Trumbull | 1 | 11.0 | 1 | 9.0 | 2 | 32.5 | | | 4 | 17.5 | 1 |
| Total No. of Schools | 10 | 7.3 | 30 | 5.5 | 25 | 12.2 | 6 | 9.8 | 71 | 9.2 | |

[a]Number of books per pupil.

collections were also given careful consideration. For example, Ashland County rated 100 per cent but had but one school included in the survey, whereas Mahoning County, with its six schools, also rated 100 per cent. Mahoning County, which afforded the greatest quantity of favorable evidence, was, therefore, ranked first, with Ashland County ranking fifth, following Erie, Geauga and Portage counties each of which had two schools, and which shared the mid-rank between one and five. The largest county, Cuyahoga which ranks first in size, reported that 25 of its 36 schools (69.4 per cent) had adequate book collections. The largest county, with all of its best library resources within the greater Cleveland area,

TABLE 4.26

ADEQUACY OF BOOK COLLECTIONS IN CERTAIN HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES,
BY COUNTIES, 1963

| County | Schools | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Adequate | | | Number | |
| | No. | Rank | Per Cent | Surveyed | Rank |
| Ashland | 1 | 5 | 100.0 | 1 | 13 |
| Ashtabula | 1 | 11 | 50.0 | 2 | 10 |
| Cuyahoga | 25 | 6 | 69.4 | 36 | 1 |
| Erie | 2 | 3 | 100.0 | 2 | 10 |
| Geauga | 2 | 3 | 100.0 | 2 | 10 |
| Lake | 2 | 3 | 50.0 | 4 | 4 |
| Lorain | NR | 13 | NR | 2 | 10 |
| Mahoning | 6 | 1 | 100.0 | 6 | 2 |
| Medina | 1 | 12 | 33.3 | 3 | 6.5 |
| Portage | 2 | 3 | 100.0 | 2 | 10 |
| Richland | 2 | 9 | 50.0 | 4 | 4 |
| Summit | 2 | 7 | 66.7 | 3 | 6.5 |
| Trumbull | 2 | 9 | 50.0 | 4 | 4 |
| Total | 48 | Mean 66.9 | 87.6 | 71 | |

ranked sixth in North Eastern Ohio. The Cleveland Metropolitan Services
Commission reported in 1959 on the school library support in that area:
"As stated the Cleveland Public Library, contrary to the situation in
some of the other library districts, has always assumed the lion's share
of the school-library costs."[1]

The A.L.A. Standards clearly say that the responsibility for
school library services rests with the Board of Education.

Since the school library is an essential part of the total school
program, the provision of libraries in the schools is the respon-
sibility of the board of education. The administrative authority

---

[1]Arlene A. Theuer, Public Libraries in Cuyahoga County, Staff
Report to Study Group on Public Libraries, Cleveland Metropolitan Services
Commission, 1959, p. 27.

and responsibility for school libraries belong to the board of education and not to the public library.[1]

One method of meeting the continuing demand for more books is the growing use of paperback editions. Nearly 80 per cent of the schools have adopted one or more ways to promote their use (Table 4.27). A timely article was published on the paperback program of Parma Schools where the bookstore's stock is keyed to the school's curriculum.[2] The

TABLE 4.27

POPULARITY OF PAPERBACK BOOKS WITH STUDENTS, 1963

| Paperbacks | Service Offered | | Service Not Offered | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Circulated by library | 56 | 78.9 | 15 | 21.1 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Sold by school | 56 | 78.9 | 15 | 21.1 | 71 | 100.0 |

chairman of the social studies department assumed the role of manager of the paperback bookstore, located in a glass-walled room of the library's main reading room. Approximately 500 titles are supplied by a local wholesaler.

. . . our philosophy on the selection of titles is to attempt to obtain wholesale reading for all students, regardless of the young person's reading level and/or interests.[3]

The librarian's cooperation, enthusiasm, and judgment on the suitability of the books supplied by the book wholesaler, in addition to the school order, are basic to the successful paperback bookstore. The

[1] A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 33.

[2] David W. Grodhaus, "Paperbacks and the High School," OLA Bulletin, XXXIII, No. 2 (April, 1963), 26-28.

[3] Ibid., p. 27.

library staff also supervises the library patrons who visit the bookstore. They have a regulation that only those students who are in the library during a regular period may use the new facility. It will be recalled that the Deiches Report also recommended the use of paperback editions of titles that were used extensively and over a considerable period of time.[1]

Certain deductions may be made from the data in Table 4.28, which depicts the magazine and periodical holdings in the high school libraries.

TABLE 4.28

NUMBER OF PERIODICALS IN HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES, 1963[a]

| Number of Subscriptions | Schools | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | JHS | | J-SHS | | Combined | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 194 | | | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 120-134 | | | 2 | 4.1 | 2 | 2.8 |
| 105-119 | | | 3 | 6.1 | 3 | 4.2 |
| 90-104 | | | 5 | 10.2 | 5 | 7.0 |
| 75-89 | 1 | 4.5 | 3 | 6.1 | 4 | 5.6 |
| 60-74 | 6 | 27.3 | 10 | 20.4 | 16 | 22.5 |
| 45-59 | 7 | 31.8 | 12 | 24.5 | 19 | 26.8 |
| 30-44 | 5 | 22.7 | 10 | 20.4 | 15 | 21.1 |
| 15-29 | 3 | 13.6 | 1 | 2.0 | 4 | 5.6 |
| 1-14 | | | 2 | 4.1 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Total Number of Schools | 22 | 99.9 | 49 | 99.9 | 71 | 99.8 |

[a]A.L.A. recommends 70 titles for JHS and 120 titles for SHS. A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs, 1960, p. 78.

The number of subscriptions reported by the junior high schools and the junior-senior high schools may be seen in ten steps. The mode for the school libraries was between 45 and 59 regular subscriptions, which was

[1]Deiches, op. cit., p. 41.

far below the recommendations of A.L.A. which calls for 70 titles at the junior high level and 120 in senior high schools.[1] Less than one-third of the junior high schools, and less than 5 per cent of the senior high schools, met the requirements.

Evidence of wide disregard for the most current reference sources weakens any belief that materials in North Eastern Ohio high schools were as good as they should be. Enrollment was not considered when tabulating this service because the Standards make it clear that the number of titles needed is not greatly affected by the number of students in the school, but that schools offering a special program in technical, vocational or other areas obviously need to expand the scope and size of their collections so as to include magazines in the special fields.[2]

The full use of magazines requires both time and space. The Standards recommend that magazines be kept for five years. Schools have reported that serious spatial problems restrict their magazine services. The data did not reveal how many schools were using microforms, but the possibility of scanning magazines photographed on film, sections of which may be readily enlarged, reprinted and circulated, should be explored by school libraries.[3] Devices currently used in some schools include photocopiers or photoduplicators which rapidly reproduce full pages of printed or illustrated material. Such equipment is also space-consuming, but the location of reading stations, carrells in the library, or

---

[1] A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 79.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Irving M. Klempner, "The Influence of Photoreproduction on Library Operations," Library Resources and Technical Services, VII, No. 3 (Summer, 1963), 244-253.

glass-walled areas adjacent to the library, may actually be a more profitable use of space than extensive magazine storage.

Significant, too, is the time spent in the search for pertinent magazine articles. One librarian working with more than 300 students cannot hope to train students to find magazine information or to locate all of the references needed by teachers and students. Sufficient library help would also improve the use of present collections of magazines in high school libraries.

When schools were asked to describe their best method of handling periodicals, some of the replies (less than one-third) concerned consecutive runs of magazines which usually exceeded a five-year file. The display and circulation of magazines were mentioned by 25 per cent of the schools as especially effective, and about 10 per cent reported circulating new magazines to teachers. Some of the schools regarded their purchasing procedure as satisfactory, especially when it was handled by a local agent or a magazine service.

Table 4.29 summarizes the schools' evaluation of their magazine

TABLE 4.29

EVALUATION OF PAMPHLET, NEWSPAPER, AND MAGAZINE SERVICES, 1963

| Service | Superior | | Average | | Poor | | Total | |
|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Pamphlets | 40 | 56.3 | 25 | 35.2 | 6 | 8.5 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Newspapers<br>3-8 subscriptions<br>1-2 subscriptions<br>None<br>Combined | 42 | 59.2 | 25 | 35.2 | 4 | 5.6 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Magazines | 48 | 67.6 | 11 | 15.5 | 12 | 16.9 | 71 | 100.0 |

services, as well as those concerned with pamphlets and newspapers.

In two-thirds of the schools, the principals estimated that the magazine service was superior in quality, but one-third frankly said the service was poor or only average. Even fewer schools judged the pamphlet service to be superior to that of magazines or newspapers. Taken all together, over 50 per cent of the schools said all three services were excellent.

In 1963, every school had at least one newspaper subscription, but only 59.2 per cent met the Standard of three to six subscriptions.[1] In a few schools, the pamphlet collection was described as extensive and current, reflecting the high level of interest of those librarians. In some schools very little was said about their collection of pamphlets.

The role of the school library in the management of audio-visual services is one in which the philosophy differs greatly. A series of questions were asked to learn how these services were functioning, and whether the principals felt that the library should show greater interest in developing into a complete materials center.

Nearly 85 per cent of the schools in North Eastern Ohio had a separate audio-visual department, but 40.8 per cent of these departments were located near the library (Table 4.30). About one school in seven has indexed all audio-visual materials in the school library. This would tend to show that instructional materials centers could be realized without great physical change in well over half of the schools (56.3 per cent). The principals, however, did not generally favor the library handling the circulation of realia or equipment such as globes, maps, display items and reading machines. Only 18.3 per cent thought the

---

[1]A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 79.

## TABLE 4.30

### AUDIO-VISUAL SERVICES IN SCHOOLS OF VARIOUS SIZES, 1963

| Audio-Visual Services Library Functions | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000-3,999 | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 0-99 | | Total | |
| | No. | %[a] | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| A. Separate audio-visual department | 8 | 80.0 | 26 | 86.7 | 22 | 88.0 | 4 | 66.7 | 60 | 84.5 |
| 1. Material indexed in the library | 1 | 10.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 4 | 16.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 11 | 15.5 |
| 2. Material located near the library | 3 | 30.0 | 15 | 50.0 | 9 | 36.0 | 2 | 33.3 | 29 | 40.8 |
| 3. Could be handled better by library with audio-visual staff | 3 | 30.0 | 11 | 36.7 | 12 | 48.0 | 1 | 16.7 | 27 | 38.0 |
| B. School participates in filmstrip pool | 7 | 70.0 | 12 | 40.0 | 10 | 40.0 | 2 | 33.3 | 31 | 43.7 |
| C. Library should circulate realia | 1 | 10.0 | 7 | 23.3 | 5 | 20.0 | | | 13 | 18.3 |
| Schools in group | 10 | 14.0 | 30 | 42.3 | 25 | 35.2 | 6 | 8.5 | 71 | 100.0 |

[a] Percentages are based upon number of schools in each group.

library might assume that duty, but 36 per cent of the schools observed the advantages of the audio-visual materials being handled by the library, especially with assistance from an audio-visual staff.

The reasons given for handling materials in the present manner, largely through a separate audio-visual department, were partly related to organization. In the larger school districts, a central bureau apart from the school building handled the entire service. Such an arrangement appeared to be entirely satisfactory to more than half of those reporting that kind of service. Several other schools mentioned the heavy work-load already carried by the librarian and cited the separate staff of specialists who were employed to work with the audio-visual materials. A few schools reported that current building plans did not make any change in present operation seem feasible. Once more, the problems seemed to be especially related to space and personnel.

From the several questions asked of the principals and their obviously serious responses, it was apparent that the administrators in North Eastern Ohio had not been sufficiently impressed by the concept of a materials center to initiate any rapid changes towards its realization. There had been a noticeable lack in Ohio of consistent leadership in translating the idea of an instructional materials center. This may reflect the need for a State School Library Supervisor.

S.L.D.P.'s efforts in West Virginia are a good example of one state's three-year program to acquire a qualified state supervisor.[1] The Ohio principals, it would seem, were not as convinced that status quo was the best, as they were that it would take special ingenuity, hard work and additional funds to expand the current services and to create a

---

[1]S.L.D.P., op. cit., pp. 26-29.

cooperative authority between the library and audio-visual staffs. Obviously, one-fifth of the principals were fearful that if librarians attempted to house and handle the repair of complicated equipment, there would be additional problems. The Standards should assure the principals that the service would not necessarily affect the present means of dealing with the mechanics or physical handling of viewers or receivers. The great importance of centralization of materials is that the treatment of non-book materials would be of the same depth as the books, magazine or pamphlet services; thereby making a film as accessible as a book, a tape as available as a magazine article. Specialists would obviously be needed and these would have to be librarians carefully trained in the broader aspects of library science, who knew about all kinds of educational materials and how to use them effectively. "Their province is the materials of learning and teaching."[1] The cost of classifying and cataloging a book, or a film, or a recording may vary according to the method and procedure that was followed and the quality of service depended upon the personnel and equipment available. Whether the material was cataloged by an audio-visual specialist, or by a librarian, or by someone else, it must be integrated with other cataloged materials in order to bring students and teachers into quick contact with all of the available sources of information.

In North Eastern Ohio high schools, 52.1 per cent of the library staffs performed the cataloging as well as the book ordering, processing and repairing of printed materials. Over 50 per cent of the libraries received full or partial assistance from a public library or other source, and 46.5 per cent of the schools had contracts for service from

---

[1]A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., p. 61.

a public library (Table 4.31). The quality and quantity of library in-
struction, reading guidance, curriculum enrichment, reference service,
and the availability of time for the selection of materials are greatly
affected by the time expended on technical services.

The Standards would encourage schools to reduce the duplication
of technical processes by creating a centralized operation, or to con-
tract with a public library for such services.

> Centralized technical processing constitutes a form of co-opera-
> tive planning for school libraries that may take place before
> the establishment of a materials center.[1]

S.L.D.P.'s interest in centralized processing was a factor in
the Illinois study.[2]

> Under some circumstances, the public library may do the process-
> ing of materials for the school that does not have access to
> this type of service in the school system. . . . If the public
> library assumes responsibility for processing materials for the
> school library, the board of education pays for this service . . .[3]

Assistance with book selection and reference service are two
principal reasons for suggesting the book catalog for schools, although
the current interest in the subject arises mainly from the economic fac-
tor affecting libraries of all kinds and proportions.

> The advent of the copy camera and the technical perfection of
> offset printing methods have made it possible greatly to reduce
> production costs of book catalogs. At the same time, card cata-
> log costs, particularly for filing, storage, and catalog equip-
> ment, have risen.[4]

---

[1]A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., footnote p. 112.

[2]S.L.D.P., op. cit., p. 38.

[3]A.L.A. Standards, op. cit., footnote p. 112.

[4]Fred Heinritz, "Book Versus Card Catalog Costs," a summary of a
doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, April, 1963, in Library Re-
sources and Technical Services, VII, No. 3 (Summer, 1963), 229.

TABLE 4.31

CURRENT METHODS OF HANDLING TECHNICAL SERVICES: BOOK ORDERING, CATALOGING, PROCESSING AND REPAIRING, 1963

| Technical Service | Enrollment | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2,000-3,999 | | 1,000-1,999 | | 500-999 | | 0-99 | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| A. 1. Performed by school library staff | 4 | 40.0 | 15 | 50.0 | 12 | 48.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 37 | 52.1 |
| 2. With assistance of public library or other outside source | 7 | 70.0 | 17 | 56.7 | 11 | 44.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 38 | 53.5 |
| 3. Through contract with public library | 4 | 40.0 | 15 | 50.0 | 11 | 44.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 33 | 46.5 |
| 4. Interest in book catalog | 6 | 60.0 | 17 | 56.7 | 14 | 56.0 | 4 | 66.7 | 41 | 57.7 |
| Schools in group | 10 | 14.0 | 30 | 42.3 | 25 | 35.2 | 6 | 8.5 | 71 | 100.0 |

The book catalog has other important implications for school libraries.

> Utilization of the book for centralized technical processing and union catalog becomes no longer an object of wishful thinking, but the most practical device currently available to record and disseminate the record of library holdings. . . . The highly adaptable book form can be tailor-fit to the needs of a particular school or public library district, academic library plexus, or inter-district cooperative project.[1]

The schools showed appreciable interest in an annotated catalog which would bring county-wide, regional, state or national library holdings within reach of every student. If such catalogs were available, contractual schools might request multiple copies which could be located in different sections of the school for more convenient reference. Copies of the holdings of other libraries which could be accessible to students and teachers might also constitute a valuable, added service. Indexes of holdings of a nearby public library, or a regional center, could be made with computerized equipment at a designated library center. Although extensive development would add considerably to the cost, the utilization of the newer equipment, and the training of personnel, greatly need upgrading. Traditional library methods are rapidly becoming antiquated.

Table 4.32 summarizes the judgments of the principals relative to five ways of improving library communications. The first key relates to library instruction. In 1956, Ohio schools reported library instruction as the best of the five services. In 1963, the same question was asked, but in two parts: the first to determine the nature of the instruction, and the second, its effectiveness.

Each responding school attempted to define the program and to weigh its over-all effectiveness, but only 57.7 per cent of the principals

---

[1]Ibid., p. 234.

TABLE 4.32

FIVE KEYS TO BETTER COMMUNICATION, AS RATED BY THE
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, 1963

| The School Library Program: | Rated First | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Per Cent | Rank |
| 1. Effects positive working relationship with the public library | 61 | 85.9 | 1 |
| 2. Provides appropriate exhibits | 52 | 73.2 | 2 |
| 3. Informs community of school library needs | 45 | 63.4 | 3 |
| 4. Affords adequate library instruction | 41 | 57.7 | 4 |
| 5. Promotes successful communications between teachers and public librarian | 38 | 53.5 | 5 |
| Number of Schools | 71 | 99.8 | |

appraised the service as being sufficiently adequate to provide the students and teachers with an optimum knowledge of the materials available, as well as to acquaint them with the role of the library in the school. Admittedly, an affirmative answer to the question implied a superior program with little room left for improvement.

With respect to library instruction, the information given proved to be extensive. The schools had approached the problem in so many interesting and successful ways that a handbook for general distribution to students could be attractively compiled. No mention that such an instructional manual was made was received, however.

Library instruction was described by all of the 71 high school principals, and certain basic patterns were disclosed. In several schools, group instruction for the entire school was attempted through various teaching media such as an opaque projector to illustrate the

arrangement and location of materials, library regulations and privileges.
Such instruction incorporated slides and lectures, films and filmstrips.
Other plans were part of the general orientation program for either the
seventh or tenth grade.

In Kirk Junior High School, East Cleveland, the seventh grade
students were instructed in: (1) proper library conduct, (2) care of
books and library property, and (3) location of books. Eighth grade
students were taught the: (1) Dewey Decimal classification of non-fic-
tion, and arrangement of fiction books on the shelves; (2) use of the
card catalog; (3) use of the physical parts of the book. Ninth grade
students were instructed in: (1) use of the dictionary, encyclopedias,
almanacs, reference books, etc.; (2) Abridged Reader's Guide; (3) com-
piling a simple bibliography; (4) how to read, evaluate and use library
materials.

Some high school libraries reported orientation lessons for
tenth-grade English classes followed by exercises and class assignments.
Instruction through individual classes was given at specific times.
Social studies and English classes had library instruction to prepare
them for research assignments.

Orange High School, in Cuyahoga County, reported an intensive
sequence of instruction from kindergarten through grade eight. One or
two lessons were given for eleventh-grade English classes, and for
grades 9, 10, and 12 when requested. New students in high school who
lacked thorough training needed more training than the present schedule
allowed.

Other high schools reported that instruction was given in the
junior high before students used the high school library, but the method

was regarded as only fairly satisfactory. Another school library in
Cuyahoga County offered instruction for every grade every semester. An
outstanding report came from a Cleveland junior high school where the
principal's thorough understanding of the library was evident. In that
school the librarian conducted classes with the aid of an assistant and
a classroom teacher. Home work, lecture and practical applications were
used.

The majority of schools (73.2 per cent) employed exhibits to
promote library information and activities, and to display books and
other realia. Table 4.32 shows the degree of interest in this second
key to communication. Ashtabula, Geauga and Trumbull Counties apparently
provided noteworthy exhibits during 1963.

The first key to library communications involved the broader as-
pects of school-public library relationships, such as contractual agree-
ments for assistance to the school with book selection meetings, tech-
nical, audio-visual, and inter-loan services.

A published study on cooperative services in Cuyahoga County
specified the relationships which existed in 1959.[1] On the basis of the
study, the services in effect five years earlier had remained largely
unchanged, with 97.2 per cent of the schools in Cuyahoga County reporting
a positive working relationship with the public library. The state as a
whole declared that a high percentage (85.9 per cent) of its schools
were attempting to work directly with the public library to provide
better services.

The fifth key to communications concerned the teachers and the
public librarians. Slightly more than half of the principals (53.5 per

---

[1] Theuer, op. cit.

cent) thought the teachers and public librarians had achieved a workable
system of exchanging information (Table 3.32). One of the key challenges
to librarians was extensive dissemination of limited materials. It would
appear that teachers who regularly used the public library would be best
acquainted with its materials and would expedite their use by working
directly with the public librarian. In some areas, the school librarian
assisted teachers to search beyond the school library for sets of mate-
rials which could be borrowed for team projects.

Table 4.32 shows that there was greater interest in some counties
in presenting library needs to the community. In some of the larger
school districts, principals explained that the Board of Education handled
all major public relations. While it was comprehensible that such uni-
formity and consistency had their merits, some of the schools outlined
their own successful programs with the public, and some reported better
results than might have been predicted.

In Ashland, Geauga and Medina counties, the schools appeared
generally to make an effort to inform the community about the library,
but in other counties the pattern varied from one school to the other.
Taken altogether, the replies showed that 63.4 per cent of the schools
had some method of notifying the community of their needs, and 46.5 per
cent deliberately advised the community how it could help.

Although the details do not appear in the tables, more than half
of the questionnaires named the parent-teacher organization as the main
channel for public interest and support. Booster clubs, neighborhood
conferences, and citizens' library committees, and labor and civic groups
were cited as other media of communication.

One school improved its library following appeals to the board

of education by individual citizens. Many schools mentioned sizable
gains in book collections through gifts. The report of one of the
schools that "such tactics are not approved by the board of education"
reflected the attitude of a few administrators against deliberate at-
tempts to interest and promote understanding needed for library develop-
ment.

In the responses, there was considerable emphasis on efforts to
encourage greater teacher use of the library. Teachers' meetings, levy
campaigns, magazine drives, memorial funds, and grants from foundations
were said to have been worthwhile. Only one school reported failure in
its attempt to raise funds through a program of public information.

When the principals were asked to list the steps taken during
the past year to improve the school library, it was surprising to learn
of the diverse ways employed. All but a few schools (88.7 per cent)
reported on one or more such efforts (Table 4.33). Unfortunately the

### TABLE 4.33

EIGHT GENERAL AREAS OF LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT, REPORTED IN 1963

| Aspect | Number of Schools[a] | Per Cent |
|---|---|---|
| Communications and Promotion | 27 | 38.0 |
| Added Space | 17 | 23.9 |
| Added Books | 10 | 14.0 |
| Increased Budget | 8 | 11.3 |
| Added Personnel | 8 | 11.3 |
| Added Equipment | 5 | 2.8 |
| Increased Hours | 2 | 2.8 |
| Simplified Procedures | 2 | 2.8 |
| Schools Reporting Improvements | 63 | 88.7 |
| No Response | 8 | 11.3 |
| Total | 71 | 100.0 |

[a]Some schools reported improvement in more than one aspect.

individuality of the responses has been lost in the table. The difficulty of attempting to serve without a librarian, the conferences that were arranged with librarians, teachers, and students to promote greater use of the school library facilities, the care in presenting detailed needs to the board of education, and the description of tours and teas to demonstrate library needs to the public could not be preserved, but it was evident that 38 per cent of the principals had been concerned with some phase of communication.

It was gratifying to learn that many of the administrators apparently had close contact with the school library services although, somewhat disturbing, was the fact that 11.3 per cent could not report a single effort made during the past year to make the library more useful.

Nearly 65 per cent of the principals thought that closer cooperation among all kinds of libraries would have certain advantages. Table 4.34 ranks the replies without regard for the number of schools in each county. Inasmuch as the challenge of cooperation at the local level loomed larger than that at the regional or state level, it was decided to rank the recommendations only by county. A county with only one school, but which ranked 2.5 was as significant in measuring attitude as a county with several schools of the same rank. For example, Table 4.34 shows that the public high schools in Ashland, Erie, Geauga, and Trumbull counties were ready for maximum inter-library cooperation.

It was disappointing to discover areas that obviously needed improvement and to find that the school rejected the idea of a modern program which would implement it. It is likely that those schools had not sufficiently explored the situation. For example, library services programmed on a regional basis might be established to serve a large area

TABLE 4.34

PRINCIPALS' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CLOSER LIBRARY COOPERATION, 1963

| County | Recommended Closer Cooperation | | | Total of All Schools Surveyed | |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
|  | No. | % | Rank | No. | % |
| Ashland | 1 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.4 |
| Ashtabula | 1 | 50.0 | 11 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Cuyahoga | 20 | 55.6 | 9 | 36 | 50.7 |
| Erie | 2 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Geauga | 2 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Lake | 3 | 75.0 | 6.5 | 4 | 5.6 |
| Lorain | 1 | 50.0 | 11 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Mahoning | 5 | 83.3 | 5 | 6 | 8.5 |
| Medina | 1 | 33.3 | 13 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Portage | 1 | 50.0 | 11 | 2 | 2.8 |
| Richland | 3 | 75.0 | 6.5 | 4 | 5.6 |
| Summit | 2 | 66.7 | 8 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Trumbull | 4 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 4 | 5.6 |
| Total | 46 | 64.8 | | 71 | 99.8 |

such as that described in the Illinois project where adjoining Illinois communities established a materials center supported by more than one school district.[1]

The principals offered a number of suggestions pointed at greater cooperation: (1) longer school library hours, (2) the establishment of a young-adult room devoid of entertainment features, (3) more newspaper articles, (4) closer cooperation between the library and the PTA, (5) group meetings to define needs, (6) interchange of library personnel between the school and public libraries, and (7) mail service with distant libraries.

[1]S.L.D.P., p. 39.

## Summary

Part One of the present chapter discussed the general adequacy
of the participating Ohio high school libraries in 1963, including the
appraisal of facilities and services as judged by the principals.  Spe-
cial attention was focused upon schools in North Eastern Ohio.

One-third of the principals rated their own libraries inadequate
in one or more of four aspects:  (1) poor equipment and facilities (50.7
per cent), (2) lack of books and related materials (33.8 per cent),
(3) shortage of personnel (22.5 per cent), and (4) insufficient funds
(11.3 per cent).  Conversely, three of the reasons for adequate libraries
consisted of the reversal of the negative statements mentioned above,
although "assessment of changing needs" was cited instead of the direct
reference to an adequate budget.

By 1970, it was believed, new housing will be needed by 18.3 per
cent of the schools, and 57.8 per cent more will need to modernize facili-
ties and equipment.  The principals estimated that 22.5 per cent of the
schools should have additional materials, and 21 per cent, a larger staff.

## Availability of the School Library

Over 40 per cent of the reporting libraries were open more than
40 hours a week, and 36.6 per cent of the principals thought the hours
should be extended.  Summer classes, night classes, and lack of time
during the day comprised over three-fourths of the reasons given for
needing more library time.  Seven out of ten principals said that the
proximity of the public library explained why there was no need for
school library time to be extended.

The reported use of library facilities by students and teachers

was of great interest, particularly since new evidence of heavy student use in another state was recently described in the Deiches Report.[1] The present study looked for relationships between use and school enrollment, such as was noted earlier in the present study, but nothing consistent with the 1956 survey was found. In fact, with respect to use of the library, the best and poorest use seemed to occur in schools with enrollments of 1,000-1,999 students, with the next best in schools with 500-999. Quite possibly, many of the smaller schools of 1956 had grown in size and retained a higher level of service. Service, therefore, seemed to be the critical factor affecting use, rather than the size or type of the school.

A majority of the principals reported that 50-99 per cent of the students used the school library. Only 16.9 per cent claimed that all students used the library, and almost one-third (29.6 per cent) of the principals expressed uncertainty about the figure. In fact, over 40 per cent of the schools in Cuyahoga County were unable to estimate the percentage of their students using public libraries. Moreover, only 5.6 per cent of the schools reported great patronage because of school assignments. In North Eastern Ohio, Medina, Trumbull and Cuyahoga County principals reported the heaviest use of local public library services. Although some of the principals said that as many as 10 per cent of their students used a college library, 45.1 per cent were unable to answer the question.

Teachers and Libraries

Between 71 and 80 per cent of the teachers reported that they

[1]Deiches, op. cit.

used the school library, but the principals reported that the teachers generally made better use of the public libraries than the school facilities. Although almost 75 per cent of the faculty used the school services to some degree, only one-fourth used its full resources, while 50.7 per cent found the public library more satisfactory.

The kinds of assistance available from public libraries were illustrated by the Beachwood report on the contractual services offered by the Cuyahoga County library, including resources for book selection and certain technical, reference, and consulting services.

Ohio lagged behind certain other parts of the country in making the school libraries responsible for the newer media such as audio-visual materials. Services implied in the concept of "instructional materials" were not well provided for. Large school districts especially were slow to change from the pattern of services traditionally provided by the library and the separate audio-visual department. In North Eastern Ohio, with its many large districts, only 7 per cent of the libraries functioned as instructional materials centers in 1963.

## Personnel

All categories of schools with more than 500 students said that they needed more librarians than were available. Only 8.5 per cent, or one out of each thirteen schools, met the standard of one librarian for each 300 students. Eight out of ten schools needed more than one librarian, according to the judgment of the principals. It should be noted, moreover, that the principals were able to compare their libraries with the A.L.A. recommendations which had been reduced to brief form (Appendix E) and mailed with the questionnaire.

According to the National Standards, the average personnel

requirement for Ohio high school libraries, based upon current student population, was 5.2 trained librarians and 2.9 clerks per school. Only 40.9 per cent of the libraries had adequate clerical help, although many students volunteered for such clerical duties as: (1) filing, (2) shelving, (3) desk routines, and (4) typing; ranked in descending order. The duties performed less frequently by students included preparation of bibliographies, indexing, messenger service, and general assistance; all of which ranked about equally.

## Adequacy of Materials

The average Ohio public high school had 9.2 books per student in 1963. Cuyahoga County, the largest in North Eastern Ohio, had 7.8 books per student. The extensive resources of the public libraries were not included in these estimates, although they greatly augmented school services in many instances. Schools in Trumbull, Summit, Erie, Mahoning and Lorain counties had the greatest number of books per student, and all met the A.L.A. Standards.

The trend toward widespread use of paperbacks was observed in 78.9 per cent of Ohio's schools. Four out of five circulated paperbacks through the library and nearly one-fifth of the schools sold paperback editions to the students.

The great disregard for magazine service was difficult to understand. Less than one-third of the junior high schools, and 94 per cent of the junior-senior high schools, failed to meet the A.L.A. recommendations for periodicals. The reasons for inadequate magazine services were assumed to be related mainly to spatial and personnel shortages. It was significant, however, that two-thirds of the principals judged the magazine service as superior in quality. More than one-half had superior

newspaper and pamphlet services, but many were only average, and a few were actually poor.

About half of the school librarians personally handled the technical duties of ordering, classifying, cataloging and maintaining the book collection. Others had outside assistance, and more than 45 per cent contracted for such services through a public library. Obviously, current methods were not entirely satisfactory inasmuch as 57.7 per cent of the principals showed an interest in subscribing for a book catalog which would annotate and classify new materials. While the possibilities of the book catalog have not been fully explored, it should be examined jointly by the schools and outside libraries.

## Communications

The principals were quite generally interested in programs of library instruction, and the quality of some of them was obviously high. Only 57.7 per cent felt that it was the most important key to communications. Library instruction ranked fourth among the five keys noted in the questionnaire. Ranked first was a positive working relationship with the public library. Almost 86 per cent of the schools reported successful programs of this nature. Second was appropriate exhibits; third, community information programs working through the PTA and other groups, sponsoring programs of visitation, open house, newspaper contacts and other ways to involve the citizens with the library as a focal point of the school. The fourth key concerned the relationship between the teachers and the public librarians. Over half of the schools felt that they enjoyed adequate teacher-public librarian cooperation.

In 1963, 38 per cent of the principals were concerned with improving library communications. Others desired added library space (23.9

per cent), additional books (14 per cent), an expanded budget and more personnel (11 per cent each). It was encouraging to learn that 88.7 per cent of all of the principals reported eight general areas in which their libraries had improved during the school year of 1962-1963. Only 11.3 per cent did not report a major accomplishment for the betterment of the library.

In 1963, 64.8 per cent of the principals recommended closer library cooperation between the school libraries and others. Schools in Ashland, Erie, Geauga, and Trumbull counties voted for maximum cooperation. Cuyahoga County ranked ninth with 55 per cent of the schools favoring greater cooperation than the high degree that has already been effected.

### Part II. High School Libraries Evaluated by A.L.A. Standards

Fifty-four schools' principals volunteered to complete the special evaluation sheets in addition to filling out the regular questionnaire. Form III, in Appendix E, provided a thumbnail review of the standards relating to seven aspects of library services together with spaces to comment on "what our school library has" and "what our school library needs." Library quarters, equipment, printed materials, book budget, organization, personnel, as well as the library program were the areas evaluated.

The data revealed the status of Ohio high school libraries in relation to the national standards found in the reference frequently cited in the first part of the present chapter: A.L.A., Standards for School Library Programs.

In Table 4.35 the reading rooms in the high school libraries are

TABLE 4.35

OHIO LIBRARY QUARTERS COMPARED WITH NATIONAL STANDARDS, 1963

| Quarters | A.L.A. Recommendation | Adequate | | Inadequate | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| A. Reading rooms | Minimum space for 45-55 pupils or 10% of enrollment over 550: 25 sq. ft. per reader | 30 | 55.6 | 24 | 44.4 | 54 | 100.0 |
| B. Space for: | Sufficient space: | | | | | | |
| 1. Workroom | Technical processing | 23 | 42.6 | 31 | 57.4 | 54 | 100.0 |
| 2. Storage | Supplies; 5 years each for periodicals | 34 | 63.0 | 20 | 37.0 | 54 | 100.0 |
| 3. Office | 200 sq. ft. | 11 | 20.3 | 43 | 79.6 | 54 | 99.9 |
| 4. Listening and/or Audio-Visual room(s) | Storage, distribution and repair of materials and equipment; production of materials; listening and viewing | 8 | 14.8 | 46 | 85.2 | 54 | 100.0 |
| 5. Conference room(s) | One room for schools with less than 1,000 students | 26 | 48.1 | 28 | 51.9 | 54 | 100.0 |
| 6. Classroom | Adjoining reading room for library use by class groups | 13 | 24.1 | 41 | 76.0 | 54 | 100.1 |

shown to fall below the standards. Only slightly over half of the schools provided enough space for the number of students enrolled in 1963. Almost two-thirds of the schools had enough storage space for five-year runs of magazines, although it should be recalled that the number of periodicals failed to measure up to the standards in a great number of schools. Only 42.6 per cent had sufficient space for technical processing, and a mere 14.8 per cent had a library storage area for listening and viewing equipment. Slightly less than half of the schools had conference rooms, and

less than one-fourth had a classroom adjoining the reading room for library use by class groups.

Table 4.36 concerns library equipment, specifically, the three major items of shelving, tables and chairs, and card catalog. Special

TABLE 4.36

OHIO LIBRARY EQUIPMENT COMPARED WITH NATIONAL STANDARDS, 1963

| Equipment | A.L.A. Recommendation | Adequate | | Inadequate | | Total Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | |
| A. Shelving | Adequate, standard adjustable shelving; special shelving for magazines, records, etc. 25 books per shelf | 37 | 68.5 | 17 | 31.5 | 54 |
| B. Tables, chairs | Appropriate sizes | 45 | 83.3 | 9 | 16.7 | 54 |
| C. Card catalog | Standard library make | 46 | 85.2 | 8 | 14.8 | 54 |
| D. Special equipment | Book trucks, vertical files, dictionary - atlas stand, typewriter, mechanical copy machines, etc. | 45 | 83.3 | 9 | 16.7 | 54 |

equipment considered included book trucks, vertical files, dictionary-atlas stand, typewriter, and mechanical copy machines. The latter items were grouped under item D.

Library shelving, sufficient for all library materials was adequate in 68.5 per cent of the schools.

A higher percentage of the schools (83.3 per cent) had sufficient tables and chairs to accommodate the students and all but 14.8 per cent had satisfactory card catalogs. Approximately the same proportion had adequate special equipment for the services which they offered.

Table 4.37 shows that almost two-thirds of the school libraries

TABLE 4.37

ADEQUACY OF PRINTED MATERIALS EVALUATED ACCORDING TO
A.L.A. STANDARDS, 1963

| Printed Materials | A.L.A. Recommendation | School Meets Recommendations | | | | | | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fully | | In Part | | Total | | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | |
| **A. Students:** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Books | Minimum 6,000 volumes; larger schools--10 books per pupil | 34 | 63.0 | 20 | 37.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 1 |
| 2. Magazines | JHS, 70; J-SHS, 120 | 15 | 27.8 | 39 | 72.2 | 54 | 100.0 | 5 |
| 3. Newspapers | 3-6 | 30 | 55.6 | 24 | 44.4 | 54 | 100.0 | 3 |
| 4. Pamphlets | Extensive collection | 32 | 59.3 | 22 | 40.7 | 54 | 100.0 | 2 |
| **B. Teachers:** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Books | 200-1,000 titles | 16 | 29.6 | 38 | 70.4 | 54 | 100.0 | 4 |
| 2. Magazines | 25-50 professional titles | 10 | 18.5 | 44 | 81.5 | 54 | 100.0 | 6 |
| 3. Other | Instructional materials as needed | 10 | 18.5 | 5 | 9.3 | 15 | 27.8 | 7 |

in North Eastern Ohio were prepared to supply the books required by their students, although slightly more than one-fourth had enough magazines. All of the schools provided at least one newspaper but only 27.8 per cent met the recommendations for three to six newspapers. More than half of the schools had extensive pamphlet collections but 40.7 per cent reported collections that were deficient in size or scope.

The reported supply of printed materials for teachers was very poor. More than 70.4 per cent of the schools had only a fraction of the books needed by the teachers, and 81.5 per cent had less than the

recommended minimum of 25 professional magazines. It is interesting that only 18.5 per cent of the schools had an adequate supply of other instructional materials for teachers.

The adequacy of additional funds over and above the budget for regular library work for eight areas is shown in Table 4.38. Under reference books are included encyclopedias, atlases, indexes, etc. None

TABLE 4.38

FUNDS FOR LIBRARY MATERIALS AND SERVICES, OTHER THAN BOOKS, COMPARED WITH A.L.A. STANDARDS, 1963

| Funds for: | A.L.A. Standards Funds in Addition to Book Budget: | Schools That Meet Needs | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | % | Rank |
| 1. Reference books | To meet needs of school | 20 | 37.0 | 6 |
| 2. Newspapers and pamphlets | To meet needs of school | 30 | 55.6 | 5 |
| 3. Magazines | To meet needs of school | 31 | 57.4 | 3-5 |
| 4. Supplies | To meet needs of school | 38 | 70.4 | 1 |
| 5. Rebinding | To meet needs of school | 35 | 64.8 | 2 |
| 6. Audio-Visual materials | $2.00-$6.00 per student | 13 | 24.1 | 7 |
| 7. Professional materials | $200-$800 as needed | 2 | 3.7 | 8 |
| 8. Personnel (Salaries) | Comparable to professional personnel with equivalent training | 31 | 57.4 | 3-5 |

of the schools met the standards in all of the eight areas. Thirty-seven per cent of the schools had sufficient funds for reference books, and more than half had additional budgets for newspapers and pamphlets, magazines and the major item, personnel salaries. Supplies received the best

support when additional money was allocated.

Perhaps the greatest need which was not met by the schools was an adequate annual budget for the purchase of books. No attempt was made to estimate how rapidly the school library collections in North Eastern Ohio were becoming obsolete, but the evidence of woefully inadequate budgets was revealing.

Table 4.39 affords an opportunity to compare the annual allocations for books with the amount recommended by the standards. Only 21.9 per cent met or exceeded the A.L.A. recommendation. On the whole, the local schools tended to show better budgets than the city schools although the evidence was not conclusive. The greatest differences were observed in the counties with many schools, such as Cuyahoga County, which varied between 23 per cent for a city school and 238 per cent for a local school. In the smaller counties, such as Geauga, they spent only 43.2 per cent as much as the standards called for in their city school, but displayed great effort to meet their actual needs in the local school by expanding 246 per cent of what the standards actually required.

An attempt to show the strength of the library support by counties was made by ranking the counties by the percentage of the budget in relation to the recommended standards. It became apparent that geographical location, type of school, or the size of school had no discernible effect, hence no table is presented.

The high school libraries generally were well organized, as shown in Table 4.40.

Records, such as acquisition, accession and circulation statistics, were regarded as entirely satisfactory. Moreover, regular consideration was given to the physical upkeep of the book collection which

TABLE 4.39

ANNUAL BOOK BUDGETS COMPARED WITH THE NATIONAL STANDARDS, 1963

| County | Type of School | | | Book Budget | | Recommended | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | City | Local | Ex. Vill. | 1963-64 | $ᵃ | AIA Stds. | Rank |
| Ashland | | X | | $ 1,000 | 47.6 | $ 2,100 | 29 |
| Ashtabula | | X | | 1,500 | 88.2 | 1,700 | 13.5 |
| Cuyahoga | X | | | 3,600 | 58.1 | 6,300 | 22 |
| | X | | | 2,400 | 50.0 | 4,800 | 25.5 |
| | X | | | 2,100 | 72.4 | 2,900 | 17 |
| | X | | | 4,200 | 60.0 | 7,000 | 21 |
| | X | | | 3,300 | 23.9 | 13,784 | 40 |
| | X | | | 5,600 | 62.2 | 9,000 | 19 |
| | X | | | 9,500 | 74.2 | 12,800 | 16 |
| | X | | | 3,900 | 100.0 | 3,900 | 6.5 |
| | X | | | 1,600 | 30.8 | 5,200 | 37 |
| | X | | | 3,000 | 33.3 | 12,000 | 36 |
| | X | | | 1,200 | 24.5 | 4,900 | 39 |
| | X | | | 5,100 | 50.0 | 10,200 | 25.5 |
| | X | | | 1,200 | 50.0 | 2,400 | 25.5 |
| | X | | | 7,200 | 47.1 | 15,300 | 30 |
| | X | | | 3,600 | 100.0 | 3,600 | 6.5 |
| | X | | | 2,200 | 40.7 | 5,400 | 33 |
| | X | | | 1,900 | 61.3 | 3,100 | 20 |
| | | X | | 4,400 | 100.0 | 4,400 | 6.5 |
| | | X | | 4,800 | 150.0 | 3,200 | 3 |
| | | X | | 2,600 | 100.0 | 2,600 | 6.5 |
| | | X | | 10,000 | 233.0 | 4,200 | 2 |
| | X | | | 1,100 | 50.0 | 2,200 | 25.5 |
| Erie | | X | | 2,000 | 64.5 | 3,100 | 18 |
| Geauga | | X | | 9,100 | 246.0 | 3,700 | 1 |
| | X | | | 1,600 | 43.2 | 3,700 | 31 |
| Lake | X | | | 5,400 | 98.0 | 5,600 | 11 |
| | | X | | 5,000 | 100.0 | 5,000 | 6.5 |
| | | | X | 2,300 | 80.8 | 2,600 | 15 |
| Mahoning | | X | | 3,500 | 92.0 | 3,800 | 12 |
| | | X | | 620 | 49.6 | 1,250 | 28 |
| | | X | | 1,200 | 52.2 | 2,300 | 23 |

TABLE 4.39--Continued

| County | Type of School | | | Book Budget | | Recommended | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | City | Local | Ex. Vill. | 1963-64 | %ª | ALA Stds. | Rank |
| Medina | X | | | $ 1,300 | 35.1 | $ 3,700 | 35 |
| | X | | | 1,000 | 28.6 | 3,500 | 38 |
| Portage | X | | | 2,000 | 37.7 | 5,300 | 34 |
| Richland | | X | | 3,300 | 100.0 | 3,300 | 6.5 |
| | | X | | 5,300 | 98.1 | 5,400 | 10 |
| Summit | X | | | 900 | 20.0 | 4,500 | 41 |
| Trumbull | | X | | 1,000 | 41.7 | 2,400 | 32 |
| | X | | | 300 | 88.2 | 3,400 | 13.5 |

ªPercentage of budget recommended by A.L.A. Standards, 1960.

was professionally classified and cataloged in 88.9 per cent of the schools, although audio-visual aids were only partially cataloged in 38.9 per cent of the schools. Centralized facilities were reported in exactly half of the schools.

Practically none of the schools have met all of the personnel requirements specified in the standards (Table 4.41), however. Approximately one-half of the schools had one trained librarian for each 300 students (48.1 per cent) and 85.2 per cent had a full-time professional librarian. Less than half had adequate clerical help, although 74 per cent of all the schools had some clerical assistance. Only 27.7 per cent had an audio-visual coordinator, and only 3.6 per cent had an audio-visual clerk.

Almost all of the schools had student assistants (88.9 per cent), but only 11.1 per cent of them were paid for their services. More than one-third of the schools had volunteer helpers.

Nine aspects of the library program were determined to be either

**TABLE 4.40**

ORGANIZATION OF OHIO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES COMPARED
WITH A.L.A. STANDARDS, 1963

| Organization | A.L.A. Recommendation | Schools | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Meet Standards | | Partially Meet Standards | | Total | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| A. All materials | Organized for best use | 37 | 68.5 | 17 | 31.5 | 54 | 100.0 |
| B. Book collection | Professionally classi-fied and cataloged | 48 | 88.9 | 6 | 11.1 | 54 | 100.0 |
| C. Audio-Visual materials | Cataloged | 12 | 22.2 | 9 | 16.7 | 21 | 38.9 |
| D. Records kept<br>1. Acquisition<br>2. Circulation<br>3. Accession and/or shelf list | Simple as possible<br>Simple as possible<br>Simple as possible | 54<br>54<br>54 | 100.0<br>100.0<br>100.0 | | | 54<br>54<br>54 | 100.0<br>100.0<br>100.0 |
| E. Discards | Continuous re-evalua-tion of collection | 52 | 96.3 | 2 | 3.6 | 54 | 99.9 |
| F. Rebinding | Regular consideration | 54 | 100.0 | | | 54 | 100.0 |
| G. Annual report | Statistical data col-lected during the year | 53 | 98.1 | 1 | 1.9 | 54 | 100.0 |
| H. Centralized facilities | Needed when 3 or more schools make up system | 27 | 50.0 | 27 | 50.0 | 54 | 100.0 |

adequate or inadequate when compared with the standards. All libraries rated as best the lending of materials both for home use and for long and short-term loans. The items D, Home Loans, and E, Classroom Loans, tied for first place (Table 4.42).

The reference service, the third best service, was rated as ade-quate by 98.2 per cent of the schools. It was anticipated that more schools would report adequate programs of library instruction. This

TABLE 4.41

PERSONNEL IN SCHOOL LIBRARIES OF OHIO COMPARED WITH
A.L.A. STANDARDS, 1963

| Personnel | A.L.A. Recommendation | Schools | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Meet Standards | | Partially Meet Standards | | Total | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| A. Librarians | 1.0 for each 300 students | 26 | 48.1 | 28 | 50.7 | 54 | 98.8 |
| 1. Training (full-time librarians) | 30 semester hours library science | 46 | 85.2 | 8 | 14.8 | 54 | 100.0 |
| B. Clerks | 1.0 for each 600 students | 24 | 44.4 | 16 | 29.6 | 40 | 74.0 |
| C. Audio-Visual Coordinators | 1.0 for each 600 students | 12 | 22.2 | 3 | 5.5 | 15 | 27.7 |
| D. Audio-Visual Clerks | 1.0 for each 1,200 students | 2 | 3.6 | | | 2 | 3.6 |
| E. Student Assistants | (No substitute for paid clerks). Paid for services as pages | 42 | 77.8 | | | | |
| | | 6 | 11.1 | | | 48 | 88.9 |
| F. Volunteer Helpers | No substitute for trained personnel | 19 | 35.2 | | | 19 | 35.2 |

service ranked eighth, with 33.3 per cent of the schools expressing a need for improvement. As was expected, the least adequate service would prove to be audio-visual materials and guidance in listening and viewing.

### Summary

In Part II of the present chapter certain aspects evaluated by the principals were reviewed and were related to the National Standards. In many instances, however, quantitative values were not forthcoming.

In 1963, 54 of the high school principals in North Eastern Ohio

TABLE 4.42

EVALUATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS, 1963

| Library Program | A.L.A. Recommendation | Adequate | | Inadequate | | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | |
| A. Library in-struction | Continuous, extensive plan developed by principal, teachers, and librarians | 36 | 66.7 | 18 | 33.3 | 8 |
| B. Class use | Library used as an extension of classroom when appropriate | 51 | 94.4 | 3 | 5.6 | 4.5 |
| C. Individual use | Library is open to all students and teachers before, during and after the school day | 48 | 88.9 | 6 | 11.1 | 6.5 |
| D. Home loans | Library resources easily available for home use | 54 | 100.0 | | | 1.5 |
| E. Classroom loans | Continuous short and long-term loans of all types of materials | 54 | 100.0 | | | 1.5 |
| F. Reading guidance | Comprehensive program—Joint responsibility of teachers, librarians and parents | 48 | 88.9 | 6 | 11.1 | 6.5 |
| G. Audio-Visual use | Students guided in listening and viewing | 7[a] 4[b] | 13.0 7.4 | 43 | 79.6 | 9 |
| H. Reference service | Library used as a laboratory for reference and research work by individuals and groups of students | 53 | 98.2 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 |
| I. Student assistants | Organized student participa-tion without exploitation | 51 | 94.4 | 3 | 5.6 | 4.5 |

[a]Service given in classrooms was regarded as adequate for the needs of 13 per cent of the schools.

[b]Ravenna High School in Portage County offered a continuing program of guided listening and viewing.

evaluated their libraries by using Form III, "A.L.A. Recommendations for Your School Library." The results showed that library quarters were from

37 to 85.2 per cent deficient in one or more aspects. While 63 per cent
of the libraries had adequate storage, only 14.8 per cent provided
listening or audio-visual rooms. Reading rooms were judged to be only
55.6 per cent adequate. Less than half had good work rooms for technical
services, and only 20.3 per cent provided separate library office space.
Moreover, only 48.1 per cent had conference rooms. Equipment was found
to be more satisfactory than library quarters, but almost one-third
needed more or better quality shelving. In general, fewer than one-half
of the libraries met the National Standards for quarters and equipment.

## Printed Materials

In Part I of the present chapter, it was found that the average
high school had 9.2 books per pupil. The A.L.A. evaluation showed that
63 per cent of the schools met the standards for books, and that 59.3
per cent had extensive pamphlet collections. Slightly more than half of
the libraries had the three to six newspaper subscriptions recommended
by A.L.A. The weakest area of printed materials was that of magazines.
Barely more than one-fourth (27.8 per cent) had the full quota of maga-
zines. Despite the apparent inadequacies, half of the principals were
satisfied with the periodical service.

Teachers' materials were woefully inadequate in 1963. Only 29.6
per cent had as many as the 200 to 1,000 titles specified as the A.L.A.
minimum for a professional collection, and less than one-fourth of the
schools had 25-50 professional magazines. Apparently, schools in North
Eastern Ohio neglected the entire range of teachers' materials. It was
fortunate that so many principals rated the collections, but the real
need is for the administrators to examine and compare the services where
collections are well-selected and used wisely.

## Budget

It was observed that schools did not generally allocate separate funds for library items such as reference books, newspapers and pamphlets, magazines, supplies, rebinding, newer media, and professional materials for teachers. The major item of salary, however, was usually handled apart from the library budget. The present study sought the specific amounts assigned to each item. The schools were found, for the most part (70.4 per cent) to have sufficient supply budgets, but only 3.7 per cent had funds earmarked for teachers' materials. This was obviously a logical explanation for the large percentage of teachers who used the public library. Less than one-fourth of the schools had adequate funds for audio-visual materials, magazines, newspapers and pamphlets. The amounts reported were slightly more than half the amount recommended by the standards.

The report that over 40 per cent of the schools failed to match the salary paid librarians with that of other faculty members may help to explain why more librarians are not employed in Ohio schools. While 63 per cent of the libraries met book standards, only 22 per cent of the schools met or surpassed the recommended annual budget for books in 1963. Quite possibly, many libraries with sizable collections were working in crowded quarters which would not accommodate more materials, or that needed funds were allocated for other purposes or were not available. No particular area in North Eastern Ohio was generally better supported than any other, although 78 per cent spent less for books than the standards recommended.

The principals of 54 schools had been able to provide more library personnel than the schools had generally had. Approximately one-half of

this selected group had one trained librarian for each 300 students
(Table 4.41), but in the larger group only one out of each 13 schools
fulfilled that specification (Table 4.19). Less than 45 per cent had
the minimum clerical help recommended.

Ohio's best service in 1963, as recommended by the standards,
was the availability of materials for home loans and classroom loans.
However, library hours very definitely needed to be extended. Reference
service was 98.2 per cent adequate according to the evaluations, although
in some schools the students failed to find all of their assigned mate-
rials in the school library.

It might be generalized that between one-third and one-half of
the libraries in the North Eastern Ohio schools afforded very good ser-
vice, and a few were outstanding, but the state as a whole had not made
any noticeable headway between 1956 and 1963 toward meeting national
standards.

### Part III. Library Trends in Newer High Schools

It will be recalled that 60 additional high schools were chosen
for a special inventory of their library services in December, 1963. None
had reported previously inasmuch as the mailing list which was used in
October, 1963, included only ten schools established since 1956, the year
that the present study began. Data on the newer high school libraries
were obtained through Form IV, mailed to 60 schools not previously sur-
veyed in the current study. The greatest growth in new high schools oc-
curred in Cuyahoga County, where 23.3 per cent of the December question-
naires (Form IV)[1] were circulated (Table 4.43). Summit County had 18.3

---

[1]A copy of Form IV and the list of responding schools may be
found in Appendix G.

TABLE 4.43

LIBRARY SERVICES IN 30 NEW PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS IN OPERATION
SIX YEARS OR LESS

| County | December, 1963, Questionnaires Sent to New Schools | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mailed | | Responses | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | JHS | | J-SHS | | Total | | City | | Local | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Ashland | 1 | 1.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ashtabula | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 6.3 | | | 1 | 3.3 | | | 1 | 7.1 |
| Cuyahoga | 17 | 28.3 | 5 | 31.3 | 2 | 14.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 7 | 43.8 | | |
| Erie | 2 | 3.3 | | | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 3.3 | | | 1 | 7.1 |
| Geauga | 2 | 3.3 | | | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 3.3 | | | 1 | 7.1 |
| Lake | 5 | 8.3 | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 7.1 | 3 | 10.0 | 3 | 18.8 | | |
| Lorain | 4 | 6.7 | 2 | 12.5 | | | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 7.1 |
| Mahoning | 4 | 6.7 | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 7.1 | 3 | 10.0 | 1 | 6.3 | 2 | 14.3 |
| Medina | 2 | 3.3 | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 7.1 | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 7.1 |
| Portage | 4 | 6.7 | | | 2 | 14.3 | 2 | 6.7 | | | 2 | 14.3 |
| Richland | 1 | 1.7 | | | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 3.3 | | | 1 | 7.1 |
| Summit | 11 | 18.3 | 3 | 18.9 | 2 | 14.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 3 | 18.8 | 2 | 14.3 |
| Trumbull | 6 | 10.0 | | | 2 | 14.3 | 2 | 6.7 | | | 2 | 14.3 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.3 | 14 | 99.8 | 30 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.3 | 14 | 99.8 |

per cent of the sixty new schools contacted. The proportionate growth
of junior high schools was evident by the responses from 16 junior high
schools and 14 junior-senior high schools; exactly half of the total
surveyed.

All of the counties except Ashland are represented in the follow-
ing report on the newer schools (Table 4.44). The seven schools in Cuya-
hoga County are city schools. All but eight of the 30 schools, or 73.2
per cent, reported enrollments between 400-999 students, although one in
Cuyahoga and one in Lorain County had between 2,000 and 2,999 students.
No very small schools were found.

TABLE 4.44

ORGANIZATION AND SIZE OF THE 30 NEW SCHOOLS, 1963

| County | Type of School | | | | Enrollment | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | JHS | | J-SHS | | 400-999 | | 1,000-1,999 | | 2,000-2,999 | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Ashland | 1 | 6.3 | | | 1 | 5.0 | | | | | 1 | 3.3 |
| Ashtabula | 5 | 31.3 | | | 2 | 10.0 | 4 | 50.0 | | | 7 | 23.3 |
| Cuyahoga | | | 2 | 14.3 | | | | | 1 | 50.0 | | |
| Erie | | | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 5.0 | | | | | 1 | 3.3 |
| Geauga | | | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 5.0 | 1 | 12.5 | | | 1 | 3.3 |
| Lake | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 7.1 | 2 | 10.0 | | | | | 3 | 10.0 |
| Lorain | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 5.0 | | | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Mahoning | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 7.1 | 3 | 15.0 | | | | | 3 | 10.0 |
| Medina | 1 | 6.3 | | | 2 | 10.0 | | | | | 2 | 6.7 |
| Portage | | | 2 | 14.3 | 2 | 10.0 | | | | | 2 | 6.7 |
| Richland | | | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 5.0 | 2 | 25.0 | | | 1 | 3.3 |
| Summit | 3 | 18.9 | 2 | 14.3 | 3 | 15.0 | | | | | 5 | 16.7 |
| Trumbull | | | 2 | 14.3 | 1 | 5.0 | 1 | 12.5 | | | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | 16 | 100.3 | 14 | 99.8 | 20 | 100.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 |

That factor which appeared to identify the schools with better library service was that of use by the students and teachers. Table 4.45 shows that one-half of the schools served more than 85 per cent of the students and 65 per cent of the teachers through the school library.

TABLE 4.45

EXTENT OF USE OF PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES
IN 30 NEW SCHOOLS, 1963

| Per Cent of Student Use | Schools | | Per Cent of Teacher Use | Schools | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | | No. | % |
| 100% | 8 | 26.7 | 100% | 6 | 20.0 |
| 90–99 | 5 | 16.7 | 90–99 | 3 | 10.0 |
| 80–89 | 3 | 10.0 | 80–89 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 70–79 | 6 | 20.0 | 70–79 | 5 | 16.7 |
| 60–69 | 2 | 6.7 | 60–69 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 50–59 | 1 | 3.3 | 50–59 | 6 | 20.0 |
| 40–49 | | | 40–49 | 2 | 6.7 |
| 30–39 | 1 | 3.3 | 30–39 | 2 | 6.7 |
| 20–29 | 4 | 13.3 | 20–29 | 3 | 3.3 |
| | | | 10–19 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 | Total | 30 | 100.0 |

When the schools were ranked by size, only one reported that all students used the library. It was concluded that no important relationship existed between size and the extent of use of library services among these newer schools.

In order to study the availability of library materials, the schools were arranged according to the hours per week they were open (Table 4.46). Among those reporting 100 per cent student use, 56.7 per cent were open forty or more hours per week and one-third more were open from 35 to 39 hours per week. In all of the libraries where teachers made full use of the facilities, the school library was open at least 35

**TABLE 4.46**

HOURS OF LIBRARY SERVICE AVAILABLE IN THE 30 NEW
HIGH SCHOOLS, 1963

| Hours Open per Week | Schools | | Reported 100 Per Cent Use by | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Students | | Teachers | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 40–44 | 17 | 56.7 | 5 | 62.5 | 4 | 66.7 |
| 35–39 | 10 | 33.3 | 3 | 37.5 | 2 | 33.3 |
| 30–34 | 1 | 3.3 | | | | |
| 25–29 | 1 | 3.3 | | | | |
| 20–24 | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 1 | 3.3 | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 99.9 | 8 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 |

hours a week. Availability, therefore, seemed to influence the use of
school library services.

In the eight schools that reported the greatest use, five prin-
cipals specified that their book collection was inadequate, and the
others indicated that it was improving; it would appear that time is an
important aspect in bringing new schools up to standard since all edu-
cational areas need to be developed. Ohio's guide for secondary school
libraries recognized the need for developmental stages in the attainment
of the standards.[1]

The reported use by students seemed to be unrelated to the book
or magazine collections. The mean for the eight schools reporting the
best use was 38.8 magazines, contrasted with 55.9 per school among the
remaining 22 schools.

Among the newer schools, 76.6 per cent had at least one profes-

[1]Ohio State Department of Education, Ohio Guide for Secondary
School Libraries, op. cit., p. 1.

sional librarian (Table 4.47). All schools that employed a librarian
with less than the required training also employed a clerk. The greatest

## TABLE 4.47

### LIBRARY PERSONNEL IN 30 NEW HIGH SCHOOLS, 1963

| Personnel Complement | All Schools | | 100 Per Cent Use by | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Students | | Teachers | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Trained librarian and clerk | 10 | 33.3 | 3 | 37.5 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Trained librarian without clerk | 13 | 43.3 | 3 | 37.5 | 1 | 16.7 |
| Combined | 23 | 76.6 | 6 | 75.0 | 3 | 50.0 |
| Untrained librarian and clerk | 7 | 23.3 | 2 | 25.0 | 3 | 50.0 |
| Total | 30 | 99.9 | 8 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 |

number of the new schools (43.3 per cent) afforded the services of a
professional librarian, but without clerical assistance, whereas one-
third of them had both a professionally trained librarian and a clerk.
Only two schools employed the equivalent of one librarian for each 300
students. It is noteworthy that the schools reported the best use by
its students where a professional librarian was available, but the
teachers seemed to use the library equally well when under an untrained
librarian. It seemed unusual for one school to report 100 per cent use
by its teachers and only 33 per cent by its students. In that school an
untrained librarian was in charge.

Eighteen of the 30 schools reported cooperation with public li-
braries. The percentage of enrollment using public libraries ranged
from 4 to 50 per cent, with 23.7 per cent as the mean. One wonders if
the newer schools were depending upon outside services enough to compen-
sate for their new, and, therefore, less adequate facilities.

Budget figures were next studied in relation to student use. The

highest figure reported for library needs, excluding personnel, for
1963-1964, was $8,000. Among the schools reporting the best student use
the amount varied from $690 to $8,000, with a mean of $3,030. The
largest school among the eight reporting best use allocated $5,000
whereas the school spending $8,000 had only 950 students.

The newer schools were not generally accepting the materials-
center concept, according to the reports. The majority preferred a
separate department for handling films, filmstrips and other media, and
only five of the schools (16.7 per cent) indexed such materials in the
library.

Thirteen schools (43.3 per cent) received help with technical
services from the public library or another outside source, and seven
schools reported contractual agreements with nearby public libraries for
the classification and cataloging of materials. Seventy per cent of the
newer schools said that they would find a book catalog useful but a few
qualified their responses. It seemed apparent that some of the schools
felt that the book catalog might replace the book meetings which provide
an opportunity for discussion of materials. Others might not want to be
restricted to titles in a catalog.

The programs of library instruction in the newer schools were
not much different from those in the older schools, although considerable
enthusiasm was shown in some of the answers.

Over 70 per cent of the newer schools reported an adequate pro-
gram of library instruction, but many thought it was far from being of
maximum quality.

When the principals offered their personal opinions relative to
their accomplishments, many of them noted their efforts to acquire

adequate funds as the major step toward improvement of their libraries.
One principal would extend the hours, another would make the library
more accessible, still another would delegate greater freedom to the
head librarian.

Several principals were proud of the acquisition of additional
staff and the increases in professional reference materials. It seemed
obvious that the librarians and principals were working toward common
educational goals and agreed on greater cooperation between libraries to
enhance use by the students. Although some cited the risk of losing
local control, and others specified cooperation only within their own
district, the principals generally offered recommendations for imple-
menting greater library cooperation. Among the suggestions were those
for continued conferences and workshops between school and public librar-
ies, visitation to see the services other libraries might provide, a com-
mittee composed of members of the school board, the superintendent, head
of the library, trustees and teachers created to promote the use of all
library services, and to appoint a library coordinator for the school
district.

Principals who had recently faced problems of building construc-
tion were asked for recommendations relative to the school library. In
response, the administrators advised: (1) providing for optimum commun-
ication between school personnel and the architects; (2) planning for a
ground-level library to be open at times other than school hours;
(3) having the librarian help with planning the library quarters; employ-
ing a professional librarian one year before the library opens to arrange
for its services; (4) providing adequate storage space, lighting and
ventilation; (5) establishing a budget scaled to A.L.A. Standards;

(6) planning for individual seating with no tables for groups; (7) making the library large enough to accommodate future enrollments; and (8) providing a materials center with adequate staff.

The school men named five services which they believed were best in their libraries (Table 4.48).

TABLE 4.48

LIBRARY SERVICES MOST NEEDED IN THE 30 NEW SCHOOLS,
ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPALS, 1963

| Service | No. | % | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| Making available reading, research and reference materials | 16 | 53.3 | 1 |
| Enrichment of curriculum | 5 | 16.7 | 2 |
| Reading-guidance materials. | 4 | 13.3 | 3 |
| Center for learning | 2 | 6.7 | 4 |
| Library instruction | 1 | 3.3 | 5 |

Making books and related materials readily accessible for reading, research and reference was specified by 53.3 per cent. Materials for the enrichment of the curriculum, and reading guidance, ranked second and third. Some wanted their libraries to become real "centers for learning," and, surprising as it may seem, library instruction rated last with 3.3 per cent of the newer schools claiming instruction in library to be the best service afforded.

Summary

In Part III of the present chapter, the 1963 data dealt with generalized information, as well as conditions indigenous to new libraries. It was observed that schools tended to be larger and that additional

schools were provided in every county in North Eastern Ohio since 1956.
All but one county provided data relative to new school libraries.

The use of the library by students in new schools was 10 per cent
greater than that reported in schools in 1963, but fewer of the new
school libraries served all of their teachers. It should follow that
materials for the students were stocked before the library opened, but
teachers' needs apparently were neither planned nor provided. Undoubtedly,
the hours of service influenced teacher participation inasmuch as the
best teacher use was reported by school libraries open at least 35 hours
per week. One-third of the new schools had a trained librarian and a
clerical assistant.

Materials centers to handle all of the media of instruction were
not generally provided in the new schools. Seventy per cent were inter-
ested in having book catalogs.

Probably the most important contribution of the survey of new
schools was the list of recommendations for establishing the library in
new buildings. Two outstanding recommendations were frequently noted:
to hire a competent, trained librarian to arrange for the library ser-
vices well in advance of the first day of school, and to provide an ade-
quate budget.

In conclusion, it may be noted that one-third of the principals
actually completed thorough evaluations of their school libraries accord-
ing to the A.L.A. Standards. With varying degrees of success, libraries
were found to be working toward the national standards with respect to
budget, personnel, books and certain other printed materials, but less
than one-third met most of the recommendations. Space was a problem in
many libraries.

ance.

Teachers needed to become more deeply involved in school library
services in such ways as assisting with book selection, working with the
students in the library, and directing students to specific materials
which they knew were provided.

It was concluded that the principals were generally well-informed
on library matters, and that their candid appraisals of library adequacy
were generally facilitated by rating them against the A.L.A. Standards.

CHAPTER V

COMPARISONS OF LIBRARIES IN 1956 AND 1963

## Introduction

The present chapter compares the essential characteristics of Ohio public high school libraries found in the data for 1955-1956 and 1963-1964. The comparisons may be regarded as the highlights revealed by the data presented in Chapters III and IV. Where tables seem more convenient they are intentionally brief and cumulative. Detailed statistics have been presented in the earlier chapters.

The general areas to be discussed are: (1) budget and materials; (2) quarters, facilities and equipment; (3) personnel and services; and (4) major trends in cooperation and communications. Both differences and similarities are noted.

## Budget and Materials

In 1956, school libraries which spent as much as $1.50 per pupil for books and their maintenance could be reasonably sure that the students and teachers were provided with the most important new materials. The Ohio State Department of Education and the A.L.A. supported that viewpoint, and most of the libraries were easily meeting the standards. In 1956, almost three-fourths of the schools enrolled between 100 and 1,000 students and the majority of them allocated from $500 to $2,000 to the library, principally for books and magazines. Per-pupil expenditures in Ohio ranged from $1.16 to $3.44 and the most favorable per-capita

214

budgets were found in the smaller schools. The lowest book budgets were in schools with 1,000-1,999 students. It was felt that the latter group had older, better-stocked libraries, and quite possibly lacked space for larger collections.

By 1963, the libraries had greatly increased their budgetary requirements. The standards raised the recommended minimum expenditures from $1.50 per pupil to $4.00 to $6.00 per student in order to offset the higher cost of books and magazines and to improve services. Additional funds for reference and audio-visual materials, as well as $200 to $800 more per year for professional materials for the faculty, were also recommended.

The principals' reports showed that 21.9 per cent of the schools met or surpassed the book budget recommended for very good library programs in 1963 (Table 5.1). In that year, the needs ranged from $1,250 to $15,300 for books, and actual disbursements ranged from $300 to

TABLE 5.1

BOOK BUDGETS OF OHIO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES
COMPARED WITH A.L.A. STANDARDS, 1956 AND 1963

| Budget for Printed Materials | Relationship to ALA Standards | | | |
| | 1956 | | 1963 | |
| | No. | % | No. | % |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exceeded standards | 75 | 63.0 | 3 | 7.3 |
| Reached standards | | | 6 | 14.6 |
| Equaled 50-99 per cent of the recommendations | 44 | 37.0 | 19 | 46.3 |
| Equaled 30-49 per cent of the recommendations | | | 10 | 24.4 |
| Less than 30 per cent of the recommendations | | | 3 | 7.3 |
| Total | 119 | 100.0 | 41 | 99.9 |

$10,000. In 1956, 63 per cent of the schools in Ohio exceeded the standard recommendation for book budgets in contrast to 7.3 per cent in 1963.

The highest budget figure for 1963 exceeded the recommendations by $5,800, while the poorest ranking budget was only $3,600 short of the A.L.A. standards. The 1956 expenditures were small in contrast to those of 1963-1964. Some schools spent as much as $5,500 for printed materials, while others allocated as little as $350.

The 1963 survey of budgets solicited information on separate items usually grouped by the school men into a generalized library budget. Books, periodicals, pamphlets, newspapers, reference tools and the newer media were treated as components of the budget which, altogether, totaled considerably more than $4.00-$6.00 per student. It was difficult, however, to assemble meaningful figures because the principals, for the most part, had not recorded expenditures in sufficient detail, either because they had not recognized the advantages of discrete budgeting or because the over-all budget was generally inadequate for printed materials alone.

Schools have been subjected to additional pressures for financial support of their libraries corresponding to the growth of the community and the student body. Since 1956, 14 per cent of the schools had 20-29 per cent more students than they had in 1956, and over two-thirds of all of the schools reported enrollment increases. Nearly 10 per cent experienced spectacular increases of 100-124 per cent, even in schools established before 1956. Keeping pace with growth, attaining higher standards, and providing a wealth of newer media for the instructional materials center were perhaps the outstanding educational challenges of the 'sixties.

School librarians reported limited use of certain audio-visual

materials in 1956, but the librarians had not evinced much initiative in devising workable plans for integrating the various materials for the convenience of teachers and students. Such a plan would have involved the cooperation of administrators and audio-visual coordinators.

In 1963, only 7 per cent of the responding schools regarded the library as the center for all materials of instruction. Interviews with librarians and principals, however, revealed an interest in the subject, and a concern that their own particular building either did not lend itself to such a plan or that it would be a mistake to disrupt their progressive, but distinct, audio-visual program. One school noted that the board of education had appointed an audio-visual coordinator as well as a library coordinator, for the district schools and that the budget did not provide for greater costs. Although the advantages of unification were accepted, it seemed feasible only through the cooperation of the co-ordinators. Responsibility and authority, however, would need to be clearly defined and mutually acceptable.

The data further revealed that although 84.5 per cent of the schools had separate audio-visual departments in 1963, 15.5 per cent had the materials indexed in the library, and 40.8 per cent reported that audio-visual materials were located near the library (Table 5.2).

It was not only evident that many libraries needed more substantial budgets than many of the schools provided, but also that the growth of audio-visual services had at least kept pace with the growth of the libraries. The burden of greater costs were not as ponderous as it might be expected, however, because separate budgets had already been appropriated for audio-visual personnel, equipment and materials, although they had not been consolidated in an instructional materials center.

TABLE 5.2

THE LIBRARY AND AUDIO-VISUAL SERVICES, 1956 AND 1963

| Status | Survey | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1956 | | 1963 | |
| | No. | %[a] | No. | %[b] |
| Separate audio-visual department | 16 | 3.6 | 60 | 84.5 |
| Library circulates all or part of audio-visual materials | 90 | 20.5 | 11 | 15.5 |
| Library materials centers | | | 5 | 7.0 |
| Schools preferred concentration of all media in the library | 42 | 9.6 | 27 | 38.0 |
| Audio-visual materials located near the library | | | 29 | 40.8 |

[a]Percentages based upon 439.

[b]Percentages based upon 71.

In 1956, nearly all of the schools met the current requirements for books, and all but 19.5 per cent had enough magazines, according to the post-war A.L.A. standards. It is interesting to note, however, that the subsequent revision of the standards was so marked as to make the 1956 statistics practically incomparable with those of 1963. While 15-25 magazines was the number generally needed in 1956, 70 to 125 were advocated by 1963. Table 5.3 shows the percentage of schools that met the respective A.L.A. specifications for the years 1956 and 1963.

## Quarters, Facilities and Equipment

Following 1956, the physical facilities for school libraries were improved, although only slightly more than half of the principals felt that their library reading rooms were adequate (Table 5.4). Storage

TABLE 5.3

ADEQUACY OF PRINTED MATERIALS IN OHIO HIGH SCHOOL
LIBRARIES, 1956 AND 1963

| Printed Materials | Met A.L.A. Standards | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1956 | | 1963 | |
| | No. | % | No. | % |
| Books | 414 | 94.3 | 34 | 63.0 |
| Periodicals | 349 | 79.5 | 15 | 27.8 |

TABLE 5.4

PHYSICAL FACILITIES IN OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES
1956 AND 1963

| Aspect | Adequate Facilities | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1956 | | 1963 | |
| | No.[a] | % | No.[b] | % |
| Adequate reading rooms | 205 | 46.7 | 30 | 55.6 |
| Storage area | 186 | 42.4 | 34 | 63.0 |
| Workroom | 162 | 36.9 | 23 | 42.6 |
| Tables and chairs | 326 | 74.3 | 45 | 83.3 |
| Card catalog | 392 | 89.3 | 46 | 85.2 |
| Vertical file(s) and other equipment | 310 | 70.6 | 45 | 83.3 |

[a]Based upon 439 responses.

[b]Based upon 71 responses.

space improved in more than 20 per cent of the libraries and furniture
was generally felt to be more suitable. Slightly fewer libraries reported
satisfactory card catalogs in 1963. This may have resulted from dividing
the book collections for separate junior and senior high schools, and by
the rapid influx of new entries.

One of eight general improvements reported by 23.9 per cent of the principals in 1962-1963 was the addition of space for the school library. It was notable, however, that unfavorable facilities and equipment were cited by 50.7 per cent of the principals of North Eastern Ohio as a major reason why their libraries were rated as inadequate. Although more than 70 new schools had opened in North Eastern Ohio since 1956, the majority of libraries were not enlarged in keeping with the growth of the schools. Moreover, many were reported to be inadequate in 1956.

Schools experienced an increase in needed hours of service, and in 1963 it was found that 38.5 per cent of the principals stipulated the need for summer library hours, and 23.1 per cent reported that night classes required library services.

Among the new schools, 56.7 per cent afforded library service 40-44 hours a week, while in the other schools, more than 25 per cent were open between 41 and 49 hours weekly in 1963. In 1956, only 60.1 per cent of the libraries were open before or after school and less than two-thirds (56.9 per cent) offered service every period of the school day.

There was also evidence of a greater dependence upon libraries in 1963, than in 1956, and 36.6 per cent of the principals felt that the school library hours should be extended to make more curriculum-related materials accessible during the evenings and on Saturdays. In 1963, 88.9 per cent of the libraries were open to all students and teachers before, during, and after the regular school day.

## Personnel and Services

Probably the most significant part of the 1956 study was concerned with the effect of the library staff on the quality of its services. It will be recalled that librarians rated the services offered,

and that a series of tables showed that the best services were afforded
in schools which employed both professional and clerical library staff.
Summary Table 5.5 compares the average ratings.  The next-best services

TABLE 5.5

SERVICES OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES RATED BY
PRINCIPALS, 1956

| Service | Summary Ratings[a] | | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D | Total Average Rating | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I Instructing in use of library | 1.40 | 1.26 | 1.09 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1 |
| II Promoting worthy use of leisure time | 1.06 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.94 | 4 |
| III Helping enrich the curriculum | 1.35 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 0.74 | 0.93 | 5 |
| IV Centralizing instructional materials | 1.03 | 0.87 | 0.67 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 6 |
| V Cooperating with inservice training of teachers | 1.42 | 1.21 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 2 |
| VI Cooperating with promotion of the school program | 1.26 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.98 | 3 |
| VII Sharing in the cultural life of the community | 1.10 | 0.69 | 1.11 | 0.55 | 0.82 | 7 |
| Total | 1.24 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.82 | 0.96 | |

[a]A, Ratings for schools staffed by professional and clerical per-
sonnel; B, Ratings for schools staffed by professional librarian, but
without clerical hlep; C, Ratings for schools with a sub-professional
librarian and clerk; D, Ratings for schools with a sub-professional li-
brarian and without a clerk.

were found in schools with professional leadership but without library
clerks.  Sub-professional librarians, lacking a degree in library science,
but assisted by clerical personnel, scored third best, and the least
satisfactory programs were observed where sub-professional librarians

worked alone, or only with the aid of student assistants.

To facilitate comparisons, the table also ranks the services as they were performed by all of the Ohio schools in 1956. The best service afforded by the school libraries was I, Library instruction, while Service VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community, received the fewest votes and, therefore, ranked seventh.

The identical roster of services was not studied in 1963, but it is interesting to note the change in emphasis during the eight-year period. Nine services considered most important by the A.L.A. were rated by 54 principals who also checked the supplementary portion of the 1963 survey which evaluated their libraries according to A.L.A. Standards. Library instruction ranked eighth, and Home loans and Classroom loans shared first place (1.5). (The detailed evaluation may be found in Chapter IV, Table 4.42.)

Reference service was the third best service in 1963, and the library used as an "extension of the classroom" as well as "organized student participation" tied for the rank of 4.5. Both "individual use" and "reading guidance" were more popular than "library instruction." The fact that "audio-visual use" fell to the bottom of the list was further evidence that Ohio schools were not enjoying the benefits of a complete materials center. The apparent change in interest and service satisfaction between 1956 and 1963 suggests that library services in Ohio should be evaluated more frequently in order to keep abreast of changing educational needs and developments.

The attempt to compare 1963 library personnel with that of 1956 revealed a notable increase in the percentage of trained librarians (Table 5.6). While 22.3 per cent of the schools had full-time professional

TABLE 5.6

PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS IN OHIO HIGH SCHOOLS
1956 AND 1963

| Year | Schools with Full-Time Staff with Library Degrees | |
|------|------|------|
|      | No.  | %    |
| 1956 | 98   | 22.3 |
| 1963 | 83   | 82.2 |

librarians in 1956, 82.2 per cent had them in 1963. The latter percent-
age was achieved by the combined reports from established and new schools.
The accompanying reduction of sub-professional librarians since 1956 sug-
gested certain observations. Educators seemed impressed by the need for
trained librarians, and undoubtedly many of the sub-professional librar-
ians were encouraged to earn a degree in library science. It is not
likely that over half of those employed in 1956 were actually replaced.
It is more likely that many improved their status by completing a program
of graduate study.

Although clerical assistance was available in 1963, the shortage
remained very acute. Only 44.4 per cent of the principals reported
clerical library forces that were up to the standards (Table 5.7), al-
though the improvement since 1956 exceeded 150 per cent.

Principals in Cuyahoga, Geauga, and Medina counties cited their
shortage of personnel as an inadequacy in 1963. In fact, 21 per cent of
the schools in North Eastern Ohio planned to improve their libraries by
adding staff, of which 7 per cent was clerical. Moreover, 80.3 per cent
of the principals reported that the equivalent of more than one full-time
librarian was needed, while nearly 20 per cent thought that one librarian
would be adequate. In 1963, 44.4 per cent of the schools had sufficient

TABLE 5.7

LIBRARY PERSONNEL IN 1956 AND 1963

| Position | Percentage Meeting Standards | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1956 | | 1963 | |
| | No. | % | No. | % |
| Librarian | 263 | 60.9 | 46 | 85.2 |
| Clerk | 60 | 13.7 | 24 | 44.4 |

clerical staff, according to the principals; but 55.6 per cent did not. Moreover, two-thirds of the new schools were without any clerical assistance. It was observed that the standards, based upon the midpoints of each enrollment group, showed an average need of 5.2 librarians and 2.9 clerks per school. In 1963, only 8.5 per cent of the schools employed the equivalent of one full-time librarian for each 300 students. Many of the library staffs were very inadequate although great improvement had taken place since 1956. In fact, 85.2 per cent of all of the schools had attained the A.L.A. standards for trained personnel, although less than half met the standards for clerical staff.

One of the main values of the present study was the large amount of comparative data which make it possible to identify the areas of weakness or strength in the libraries in 1963. It may be said that a library is as adequate as its services and that the quality of service controls the extent of its use. The sharp decline in the percentage of schools reporting 100 per cent use by students was surprising (Table 5.8). Despite the many more dollars spent on the libraries in 1963, the ratio of use by all of the students between 1956 and 1963 was four-to-one. In 1956, 64.9 per cent of the librarians reported that the entire student

## TABLE 5.8

### USE OF OHIO HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES BY STUDENTS
### 1956 AND 1963

| Use by Students | 1956 | | 1963 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Old Schools | | New Schools | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 100 per cent of enrollment | 285 | 64.9 | 12 | 16.9 | 8 | 26.7 | 20 | 19.8 |
| 50-99 per cent of enroll-ment | 154 | 35.1 | 47 | 66.2 | 18 | 59.9 | 65 | 64.4 |
| Schools surveyed | 439 | 100.0 | 71 | 70.3 | 30 | 29.7 | 101 | 100.0 |

body used the library, but in 1963 only a small fraction of the older libraries, as well as the newer ones reported 100 per cent use. However, the majority of school libraries in 1963 served over half of their students, and almost one-fourth of the students used the public library for school assignments.

School men in Ohio are mindful of the inadequacies of the libraries. It was noted that 79.6 per cent rated "guidance in listening and viewing" as inadequate in 1963. According to the principals, over 11 per cent had insufficient library hours during the school day, and more than a third of the principals felt that additional hours were needed beyond the school day. More than one-third of the schools felt that more books were needed, and 78.9 per cent of the schools depended largely upon paperbacks to reinforce and supplement their library collections.

## Cooperation and Communications

By 1963, most of the schools had accepted the idea of centralized libraries. Over half of the schools had arranged for assistance from

outside sources with respect to book ordering, cataloging or repairs.
Over 46 per cent had contracts with public libraries for technical
services.

In 1956, Service VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the com-
munity, was found to be virtually non-existent. But in 1963, cooperation
with the community was emphasized as their major accomplishment by 38 per
cent of the principals.

Four areas of cooperation were defined by the high school princi-
pals in the present study: (1) closer cooperation between the library
and the PTA; (2) cooperative group meetings to define needs; (3) inter-
change of library personnel between school and public libraries; and
(4) mail service with distant libraries. Neighborhood conferences,
citizens' library committees, labor and civic groups had helped many
schools. Special levies, magazine drives, visitation of outside librar-
ies, and open house were reported as effective devices. Encouraging
teachers to use the school library, and more comprehensive and contin-
ing programs of library instruction for students also helped to improve
communication and cooperation.

It was significant that 64.8 per cent of the principals recom-
mended cooperative library services. One newer service which would be
acceptable to 57.7 per cent of the schools, if it were available, was a
book catalog of current publications annotated and evaluated for student
use. Regular issues would assist independent schools with their book
selection and processing and would be useful when preparing interloan
requests.

A better climate for the exchange of information and assistance
among libraries appeared in the 'sixties. It was felt, however, that

leadership for implementing greater cooperation probably must rest with a central authority, such as a state coordinator of school libraries.

## Summary

The high school libraries of Ohio experienced impressive changes since 1956. Second only to the unprecedented growth in school population was the timely revision of the A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs in 1960, and its far-reaching influence on administrators, librarians, and citizens. Without the work of the American Association of School Libraries and the National Education Association, Ohio's libraries would not likely be working so deliberately for better library services.

Budgets have been increased to four or five times the amounts allocated in 1956; there were 62.2 per cent more trained librarians; 23.9 per cent of the schools added more space to their libraries, and most importantly, school administrators gained increased awareness of the importance of the library in the over-all school program. A wholesome attitude of concern, a willingness to evaluate current methods, and to cooperate with others in improving services became apparent.

Between 1956 and 1963, the needs of the libraries were clarified. Although the quantity of materials and the quality of services doubtless improved, books and magazines were in short supply, and library staff services were below the level of need. Although library hours increased, much additional time was needed. While a few schools pioneered with the newer concept of an instructional materials center, the greatest need was for a closer coordination of materials and services which would enhance instruction.

## SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

### The Study

The purposes of the present Ohio high school library study,
which spanned the school years 1955-1956 and 1963-1964, were threefold:
(1) to evaluate library services and their effect upon students and
teachers; (2) to study library practices in a group of selected schools,
in an attempt to identify conditions which made certain library programs
more effective; and (3) to make recommendations designed to foster im-
provement.

A checklist questionnaire (Form I) was mailed to 1,138 public
high schools in May, 1956, and the replies from 439 librarians in those
schools supplied the data for the first phase of the study. Late in
October, 1963, a second questionnaire was mailed to the principals in
149 of the schools in North Eastern Ohio that had responded in 1956.
Also included was Form III, which summarized the National Standards
(A.L.A.) for school libraries and contained a form for evaluating the
libraries. There were 71 replies to the questionnaire, and 54 evalua-
tions.

Although several new schools were included in the second survey
in order to furnish comparative material, a modified questionnaire
(Form IV) was sent to the principals of 60 additional schools that had
not been established in 1956. Thirty of these principals contributed

228

information relative to setting up the library in new schools.

In Chapter II of the present study, criteria designed to guide the development of school libraries were discussed. The best set of recommendations were found to be the A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs prepared in 1960 by many specialists including school men, librarians, and architects. The Standards envisioned wide acceptance of such concepts as independent study, team teaching, and programmed learning, and dealt with the use of newer media.

## The 1956 Survey

Analysis of the data from the Ohio high school librarians' responses to the 1956 survey may be summarized in nine statements.

1. Library interest in North Eastern Ohio was found to be greater than in the state as a whole. More than 60 per cent of the schools surveyed in the thirteen counties of North Eastern Ohio responded to the questionnaire in contrast to 32.6 per cent outside of that area. There were also more city schools in North Eastern Ohio, and 73 per cent of the junior high responses were from that region.

2. The best service offered by Ohio school libraries, as rated by the librarians, was "library instruction" which scored 1.10 on the point system with an average of 1.5. "Sharing in the cultural life of the community" was the weakest of seven services (0.52).

The services included: I, Instructing in the use of the library (1.10); II, Promoting worthy use of leisure time (0.94); III, Helping enrich the curriculum (0.93); IV, Centralizing instructional materials (0.91); V, Cooperating with inservice training of teachers (1.04); VI, Cooperating with the promotion of the school program (0.93); and VII, Sharing

in the cultural life of the community (0.82).

3. The best library services were afforded in libraries staffed with a professional librarian and a clerical assistant (1.24). Those with professional librarians, but without clerical help, ranked second (1.00). The poorest services were given when non-professional librarians operated the libraries without paid clerical assistance. Where clerks assisted non-professional librarians, the services were found to be almost as good (0.99) as where professional librarians handled the entire program.

4. It was found that 60.7 per cent of the schools met the minimum standards for professional staff, but only 13.7 per cent met the standard clerical recommendations.

One-fifth of the Ohio schools reported one professional librarian, and a very small number (2.7 per cent) had more than one. One-fourth of the library personnel had no training in library science.

In North Eastern Ohio, personnel were more adequate than in other Ohio areas. More than one-half of the schools in the former area had professional librarians, and one-third also had clerical assistance.

The median number of student assistants was found to be 10.3 per school. It was concluded that their duties were largely clerical and necessitated because the majority of the schools were lacking in paid services.

5. Budgets were generally adequate in schools with professional librarians. The average printed materials budget for libraries staffed by professional librarians at least half-time, was $2.05 per pupil. The best budgets were found in the smaller schools ($3.44 per pupil), and schools with 1,000-1,999 students had the poorest ($1.16 per pupil).

The largest schools, with 2,000 or more, allocated $1.57 per pupil for library materials. Nearest to the average budget ($2.04 per pupil) were the schools with enrollments between 500 and 999.

6. Two-thirds of the schools had satisfactory book collections, and 80 per cent met the A.L.A. Standards for periodicals, although only one out of each five schools had from 10 to 19 subscriptions as indexed in Readers' Guide. Only one-fifth of all of the Ohio high school libraries circulated audio-visual materials.

7. The greatest use of libraries by students was observed in the smaller schools. The use was in inverse proportion to the number of students enrolled.

8. It was found that 60 per cent of the libraries were open before and after school, although practically none kept evening hours. Almost half (43.1 per cent) offered only part-time service during the school day.

9. Over half of the libraries had less reading and reference space than the standards recommended, and only three-fifths had no workrooms.

### The 1963 Survey

Three sources of data from schools in North Eastern Ohio were employed in the 1963 phase of the study: questionnaires sent to the schools in 1956, the self-evaluations of school libraries by 54 principals, and the questionnaires sent to schools established between 1956 and 1963. Nine general conclusions were forthcoming, as follows:

1. High school libraries were rated inadequate by one-third of the principals in one or more of four aspects: (1) poor equipment and facilities (50.7 per cent); (2) lack of books and related materials (33.3 per cent); (3) shortage of personnel (22.5 per cent); and (4) insufficient funds (11.3 per cent).

(1) Equipment and facilities:  (a) Between 37 and 82.5 por cent of the libraries were located in buildings where quarters were deficient. However, 55.6 per cent had adequate reading rooms, 48.1 por cent had conference rooms, and 63 per cent had ample storage facilities.  Only 14.8 per cent had listening rooms.  (b) By 1970, new housing would be needed in 18.3 per cent of the schools; and 57.8 per cent would need to modernize facilities and equipment.  (c) One-third needed more or better shelving.

(2) Books and related materials:  (a) The average book stock per pupil was 9.2 volumes.  (b) Paperback editions were used to some extent in 78.9 per cent of the libraries.  (c) Of the entire group of libraries, 63 per cent met the standard recommendations for books.  (d) Magazine service was found to be highly inadequate; less than a third (27.8 per cent) of the junior high schools, and 6 per cent of the sanior high schools met the A.L.A. Standards.  (e) Less than one-third provided sufficient professional materials for the staff.

(3) Personnel:  (a) Principals in the 54 selected schools reported more library personnel than was found in the Ohio schools, generally.  One school in two had the equivalent of one professional librarian for each 300 students in contrast to one in 13 for the larger group. (b) The average personnel requirement, based upon current student population, was found to be 5.2 professional librarians and 2.9 clerks per school.  (c) Less than half of the libraries had sufficient clerical staff (40.8 per cent).  (d) Eight out of ten principals reported the need for more than one librarian.  (e) By 1970, 21 per cent of the libraries felt that they would need larger staffs.  (f) Over 40 per cent of the librarians failed to receive salaries equal to those paid to other

faculty members with equivalent training.

(4) Budget: (a) With respect to budgets, almost one-fourth (22 per cent) of the schools equaled or surpassed the A.L.A. standards, while 78 per cent spent less than the amount recommended. (b) Budgets for magazines, newspapers and pamphlets were only half adequate. (c) Only 3.7 per cent of the schools provided separate budgets for professional materials. (d) Less than one-fourth of the schools had sufficient budgets for audio-visual materials.

2. Less than half of the libraries (40 per cent) were open more than 40 hours per week, although 36.6 per cent of the principals recommended extended hours of service.

(1) The proximity of a public library was the reason cited by seven out of ten principals for not extending school library hours.

3. Use of libraries by students and teachers:

(1) Only 16.9 per cent of the responding schools reported use of the school library by all of their students, although the newer schools reported 10 per cent greater use by the students. (a) The majority reported between 50 and 99 per cent student use. (b) Only 5.6 per cent of the schools thought that their students generally used the public library for school assignments. (c) Three-fourths of the teachers used the school library on occasion, but 50.7 per cent found the public library more satisfactory. The newer libraries served fewer teachers than those established prior to 1956.

4. The outstanding school library service in 1963 was that of making available materials for home loans and class loans. Reference service was reported to be adequate in 98.2 per cent of the schools.

5. A reluctance to accept the materials-center concept was evident

inasmuch as only 7 per cent of the school libraries functioned as a center in 1963.

6. A majority of the principals (88.7 per cent) reported improvements in their libraries during the preceding year as follows: communication and promotion of services (38 per cent); added space (23.9 per cent); added books (14 per cent); increased budgets (11.3 per cent); added personnel (11.3 per cent); added equipment (7 per cent); increased hours (2.8 per cent); simplified procedures (2.8 per cent).

7. The principals suggested five ways in which to improve communication between the libraries and their patrons: (1) positive working relationship with the public library; (2) appropriate exhibits; (3) programs of community information; (4) library instruction; and (5) teacher-public librarian cooperation. Approximately two-thirds (64.8 per cent) of the principals recommended closer cooperation with other libraries than had already been accomplished.

8. It was found that one-half of the school librarians handled the technical work of the school library, such as ordering, classifying, cataloging and repairing materials, although 45 per cent contracted for such services through a public library. Moreover, 57.7 per cent of the older schools and 70 per cent of the newer schools expressed an interest in subscribing to a book catalog which would assist in selection, reference work, team teaching, independent study, etc.

9. Two recommendations were emphasized by the principals in the newer high schools: (1) hire a competent, trained librarian to arrange for the library services well in advance of the first day of school; and (2) provide for an adequate budget.

## 1956 and 1963 Compared

Four significant improvements were accomplished in Ohio during the eight years covered by the present study:

1. Quarters and equipment became more adequate in 10 per cent of the schools.

2. Personnel were added, and the number of professionally-trained librarians increased by 60 per cent. (1) An additional one-fourth of the schools met the A.L.A. national standards for librarians. (2) More than an additional 30 per cent met the standards for clerical personnel.

3. Interest in the library increased as a result of cooperative community action.

4. Library budgets tripled between 1956 and 1963.

Greater needs were indicated in 1963 than in 1956:

1. While 63 per cent of Ohio school libraries met the national standards for printed materials in 1956, only 21.9 per cent reached the revised standards in 1963. (1) One-fourth of the schools failed to receive as much as one-half of the sum recommended. (2) One-third more schools were below the standard for books, and over 50 per cent more fell below the minimum periodical requirement since 1956.

2. Library services in 1963 were found to be less adequate than in 1956. (1) In 1956, 64.9 per cent of the school libraries served 100 per cent of the students, but by 1963, only 19.8 per cent were able to handle the entire enrollment adequately. (2) Two-thirds of the school libraries served between 50 and 99 per cent of their students in 1963. (3) Teachers generally preferred the services of the public library to those of the school library.

## Conclusions

Throughout the study, an adequate budget was noted as the primary need of school libraries in Ohio, although the need for more space was also obvious. Extension of the idea of a materials center to encompass audio-visual and other newer media loomed as a provocative challenge for school men and librarians. Services of the school libraries were not meeting the needs of all of the school citizens. Clerical assistance was notably lacking. About two-thirds of the principals seek closer cooperation with other libraries. It was generally felt that communications should be improved among all groups interested in school library services. For example, a newsletter from the Ohio Association of School Librarians might apprise Ohio principals of newer library developments.

## Implications

In view of the data presented in the present study, it seems reasonable to suggest that:

1. Boards of education, especially in the larger urban areas, should promote conferences among key personnel in local schools and colleges, and in public and special libraries. Consultants should be employed to help explore methods by which all library services, including materials, facilities, and personnel, could be more effectively utilized for educational purposes.

2. The functions of the library personnel should be examined to define duties and responsibilities and to prepare written job descriptions.

3. Principals should be kept informed of library issues and practices, and should be encouraged to evaluate their own libraries as a

component part of their reports to the State Board of Education.

4. Special studies should be made of the local public and school library facilities with the intention of fostering cooperation and the pooling of resources.

5. Principals should assume the leadership in adapting present library facilities and personnel to establish and operate an effective materials center.

6. Programs of public information relative to library services should be prepared by a central service in order to advise taxpayers of the status of their school library as compared with the best in Ohio.

7. The Ohio Association of School Librarians and the Ohio Education Association should prepare programmed material on the effective use of library services.

8. There should be a study of library methods which promote and preserve quality practices.

9. Prompt, concerted action should be taken to appoint a qualified state coordinator for all Ohio school libraries.

APPENDICES

A. Checklist Questionnaire, 1956, Form I

B. Sources of 1956 Data on Library Services in Ohio Public
   High School Libraries, Table I

C. Ratings by 39 Professional Librarians with Clerical
   Assistants, of Seven Library Services in Public High
   Schools in North Eastern Ohio by Counties, 1956,
   Table I; Ratings by 38 Professional Librarians with-
   out Clerical Assistants, of Seven Library Services
   in Public High Schools in North Eastern Ohio by
   Counties, 1956, Table II; Ratings by 11 Sub-Profes-
   sional Librarians with Clerical Assistants, of Seven
   Library Services in Public High Schools in North
   Eastern Ohio by County, 1956, Table III; Ratings by
   47 Sub-Professional Librarians without Clerical As-
   sistants, of Seven Library Services in Public High
   Schools in North Eastern Ohio by County, 1956,
   Table IV.

D. Questionnaire, 1963, Form II

E. A.L.A. Recommendations for Your School Library, Form III

F. Sources of 1963 Data on Ohio Public High School Librar-
   ies, Table I

G. Questionnaire, December, 1963, Form IV

H. Sources of Data on New High Schools, Table I

APPENDIX A

CHECKLIST QUESTIONNAIRE, FORM I

Name of School_____
Address_____
Principal_____
Reporter_____ Title_____

## LIBRARY SERVICES IN OHIO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

The information requested below is needed to obtain an overview of school library practices in effect under various conditions. This is a study being conducted under the sponsorship of Dr. C. B. Allen, Professor of Education at Western Reserve University. Will you please ask the head of your library to assist in completing this form so that it may be returned by May 18, 1956.

Thank you sincerely for your cooperation.

## PART I. BACKGROUND

I. The School's Community
   A. Number enrolled in grades:
      1. 7 through 9_____. 2. 10 through 12_____.
   B. Number using school library:
      1. Pupils_____. 2. Teachers_____. 3. Others_____.
   C. Approximate number of square miles served_____.

II. Physical Aspects of the Library

      |  | (Yes) | (No) |
      |---|---|---|
      | A. Environment: | | |
      | 1. Desirable location | 1. ____ | ____ |
      | 2. Pleasant atmosphere | 2. ____ | ____ |
      | 3. Adequate size | 3. ____ | ____ |
      | 4. Storage | 4. ____ | ____ |
      | 5. Workroom | 5. ____ | ____ |
      | 6. Other_____ | 6. ____ | ____ |
      | B. Equipment: | | |
      | 1. Suitable tables and chairs | 1. ____ | ____ |
      | 2. Adequate facilities for circulation | 2. ____ | ____ |
      | 3. Card catalog | 3. ____ | ____ |
      | 4. Vertical file(s) | 4. ____ | ____ |
      | 5. Other_____ | 5. ____ | ____ |

III. Stock of Library Materials
   A. Books:
      1. Number of volumes last inventory_____ Date_____
      2. Number of textbooks included above_____
   B. Periodicals:
      1. Number of current subscriptions_____
      2. Number indexed in Readers' Guide_____

      |  | (Yes) | (No) |
      |---|---|---|
      | C. Audio-Visual and mechanical aids: | | |
      | 1. Indexed in library | 1. ____ | ____ |
      | 2. Circulated by library | 2. ____ | ____ |
      | 3. Ordered and purchased by library | 3. ____ | ____ |

   D. Other_____
      _____

IV. Affiliations
    A. The school library borrows from other agencies:    (Yes)  (No)
        1. Books are borrowed regularly from city, county
           and/or state library         1. _____  _____
        2. Audio-Visual aids are borrowed regularly
           from libraries and other sources      2. _____  _____
        3. Specimens are borrowed regularly from
           museums                    3. _____  _____
        4. Other_____

V. Library Staff

| | No. on Staff | Total Lib. Hrs. per Week |
|---|---|---|
| A. Description: | | |
|   1. Library degree plus baccalaureate | 1. _____ | _____ |
|   2. 15 or more semester hours of library science (not including 1) | 2. _____ | _____ |
|   3. 6 or more semester hours of library science (not including 1 and 2) | 3. _____ | _____ |
|   4. Faculty members with less than 6 hours of library science | 4. _____ | _____ |
|   5. Clerical assistants | 5. _____ | _____ |
|   6. Student assistants | 6. _____ | _____ |
|   7. Other_____ | 7. _____ | _____ |

    B. Extent of coverage:
        1. At least one paid staff member is on duty:    (Yes)  (No)
          a) Before and after classes for a
             reasonable time            a)_____  _____
          b) During almost every period      b)_____  _____
          c) Other (Describe)_____
                                  c)_____  _____

VI. BUDGET
    A. Amount allocated, 1956 by:
        1. Board of Education_____
        2. City or county library_____
    B. Sizable gifts, 1956_____
    C. Total library budget is approximately what per cent of the
       school's budget_____

## PART II.  SERVICES

Key:  A. Service extends beyond our minimum requirements.
       B. Service meets minimum needs of our school.
       C. The need is present, but the service is not offered.

Instructions:  Please check the box which best describes each service in
                your library.

The Library Serves Pupils, Teachers and the Community by:

                                     A  B  C

1. Instructing in library usage:  arrangement, location
   and use of all books and facilities; reference
   materials, catalog, indexes               1. | | | |

2. Promoting worthy use of leisure time: providing
   material on hobbies, handicrafts, current events,
   conducting hobby clubs, reading contests, in-
   viting visitors to stimulate new interests for
   leisure time
3. Enriching the curriculum: serving on curriculum
   committees, circulating curricula of other
   cities, helping with reading assignments
4. Centralizing instructional materials: audio-visual
   aids, specimens, mechanical devices as well as
   books, periodicals and pamphlets
5. Cooperating with in-service training of teachers:
   displaying announcements of graduate courses,
   professional lectures, conventions and meetings,
   by directing professional publications to those
   particularly concerned.
6. Cooperating with the promotion of the school
   program: audio-visual services, guidance and
   health services, reading improvement
7. Sharing in the cultural life of the community:
   assisting in civic projects, organizing
   parents' reading clubs, publicizing concerts,
   plays, lectures, exhibits
8. Others. (Write in.)_____

| | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |
| 4. | | | |
| 5. | | | |
| 6. | | | |
| 7. | | | |

Which of the services specified above do you feel is most expertly
performed by your school library? (Please circle one.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Which of the services specified is least satisfactory in your
library? (Please circle one.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Has your library been evaluated during the last three years? (Please
circle one.) Yes   No

What plans for evaluation within the next three years have you
considered?_____

Will you please assist with a more detailed checklist which will be
distributed early next fall to a selected group of high schools? (Please
circle one.) Yes   No

APPENDIX B

SOURCES OF 1956 DATA ON LIBRARY SERVICES IN OHIO PUBLIC
HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES

TABLE I

SOURCES OF 1956 DATA ON LIBRARY SERVICES IN OHIO
PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES[a]

| County | Schools Providing Data | | Type of District | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
| Adams | 317 | Seaman High | | X | |
| Allen | 93 | Central Junior High | X | | |
| | 272 | Spencerville High | | X | |
| | 396 | Shawnee High | | X | |
| Ashland | 97 | Ashland High | X | | |
| | 439 | Polk Local High | | X | |
| Ashtabula | 163 | Ashtabula High | X | | |
| | 23 | Conneaut Junior High | X | | |
| | 34 | West Junior High | X | | |
| | 262 | Austinburg High | | X | |
| | 169 | Dorset High | | X | |
| | 307 | Geneva High | | X | |
| | 261 | Jefferson High | | X | |
| | 299 | Kingsville Junior High | | X | |
| | 323 | Saybrook Junior High | | X | |
| Athens | 198 | Athens High | X | | |
| Auglaize | 290 | Memorial High | X | | |
| | 19 | Minster High | | X | |
| | 145 | New Knoxville Village | | X | |
| | 415 | New Bremen High | | X | |
| Belmont | 83 | Martins Ferry High | X | | |
| | 178 | Belmont High | | X | |
| | 401 | Bethesda High | | X | |
| | 115 | Powhatan High | | X | |
| | 246 | Bridgeport High | | | X |
| | 348 | Barnesville High | | | X |
| Brown | 421 | Ripley-Union High | | X | |
| | 162 | Georgetown High | | | X |
| Butler | 4 | Hamilton High | X | | |
| | 203 | Lemon-Monroe High | X | | |
| | 417 | Macadeer High | X | | |
| | 197 | Middletown Junior High | X | | |
| | 286 | Roosevelt Junior High | X | | |
| | 340 | Washington Junior High | X | | |

[a]Replies from 437 high schools were tabulated.

244

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Schools Serveyed | | | Type of District | | |
|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|----------------|
| | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
| Carroll | 403 | Augusta High | | X | |
| | 259 | Dellroy High | | X | |
| Champaign | 394 | Graham Local High | | X | |
| Clark | 80 | George Rogers Clark Junior High | X | | |
| | 206 | Hayward Junior High | X | | |
| | 170 | Keifer Junior High | X | | |
| | 245 | Roosevelt Junior High | X | | |
| | 334 | Schaefer Junior High | X | | |
| | 346 | Springfield Senior High | X | | |
| | 385 | Catawba Local High | | X | |
| | 377 | New Moorefield High | | X | |
| | 56 | Possum Junior High | | X | |
| | 95 | Southeastern High | | X | |
| | 157 | Tecumseh High | | X | |
| Clermont | 141 | Owensville High | | X | |
| | 99 | Milford High | | | X |
| Clinton | 241 | Simon-Kenton Local High | | X | |
| Columbiana | 55 | East Liverpool High | X | | |
| | 123 | Wellsville High | X | | |
| | 215 | United High | | X | |
| | 301 | Leetonia High | | | X |
| Coshocton | 92 | Conesville Rural | | X | |
| | 268 | Keene Local High | | X | |
| Crawford | 314 | Holmes-Liberty High | | X | |
| | 345 | Jefferson Local High | | X | |
| | 365 | Mt. Zion High | | X | |
| | 89 | Whetstone High | | X | |
| | 321 | Crestline High | | | X |
| Cuyahoga | 267 | Albert Bushnell Hart High | X | | |
| | 31 | Audubon Junior High | X | | |
| | 27 | Bay Village High | X | | |
| | 310 | Brooklyn High | X | | |
| | 233 | Brownell Junior High | X | | |
| | 364 | Central Junior High | X | | |
| | 240 | Charles F. Brush Memorial Junior High | X | | |
| | 306 | Cleveland Trade (West) | X | | |

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Schools Surveyed | | Type of District | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
| Cuyahoga (continued) | 367 | East Technical High | X | | |
| | 22 | Emerson Junior High | X | | |
| | 209 | Euclid Central High | X | | |
| | 75 | Euclid Senior High | X | | |
| | 155 | Frank L. Wiley Junior High | X | | |
| | 158 | Glenville High | X | | |
| | 51 | Garfield Heights High | X | | |
| | 305 | Harding High | X | | |
| | 402 | James Ford Rhodes High | X | | |
| | 265 | John Adams High | X | | |
| | 30 | John Hay High | X | | |
| | 175 | John Marshall High | X | | |
| | 266 | Kennard Junior High | X | | |
| | 429 | Lakewood High | X | | |
| | 40 | Lincoln High | X | | |
| | 171 | Maple Heights High | X | | |
| | 18 | Mayfield High | X | | |
| | 309 | Monticello Junior High | X | | |
| | 69 | Myron T. Herrick Junior High | X | | |
| | 167 | Nathan Hale Junior High | X | | |
| | 79 | Newton D. Baker Junior High | X | | |
| | 5 | North Olmsted High | X | | |
| | 418 | Parma Schaaf Junior High | X | | |
| | 372 | Parma Senior High | X | | |
| | 370 | Pleasant Valley Junior High | X | | |
| | 81 | Patrick Henry Junior High | X | | |
| | 216 | Rawlings Junior High | X | | |
| | 177 | Rocky River High | X | | |
| | 39 | Roosevelt Junior High | X | | |
| | 250 | Roxboro Junior High | X | | |
| | 68 | Shaker Heights Senior High | X | | |
| | 107 | Shaker Heights Junior High | X | | |
| | 279 | Shaw High | X | | |
| | 380 | Shore Junior High | X | | |
| | 47 | South High School | X | | |
| | 281 | Thomas Edison | X | | |
| | 235 | W. H. Kirk Junior High | X | | |
| | 368 | Wm. Dean Howells High | X | | |
| | 106 | Wilson Junior High | X | | |
| | 315 | Brecksville High | | X | |
| | 376 | Cuyahoga Heights High | | X | |
| | 43 | North Royalton High | | X | |
| | 150 | Olmsted Falls Township High | | X | |
| | 142 | Orange High | | X | |
| | 319 | Solon High | | X | |
| | 435 | Warrensville Heights High | | X | |
| | 234 | Westlake High | | | X |
| | 249 | Chagrin Falls High | | | X |

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Schools Surveyed | | Type of District | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
| Darke | 426 | Greenville High | X | | |
| | 353 | East Side High | | X | |
| | 271 | Gettysburg High | | X | |
| | 392 | New Madison High | | X | |
| Defiance | 108 | Defiance High | X | | |
| | 236 | Farmer Local High | | X | |
| | 252 | Hicksville High | | | X |
| Delaware | 113 | Willis High | X | | |
| | 407 | Elm Valley Local High | | X | |
| | 332 | Olentangy High | | X | |
| | 205 | Scioto Valley High | | X | |
| Erie | 143 | Sandusky High | X | | |
| | 2 | Berlin Local High | | X | |
| | 53 | Huron High | | X | |
| | 109 | Kelleys Island Local High | | X | |
| | 337 | Margaretta High | | X | |
| | 159 | Vermilion High | | X | |
| Fairfield | 388 | Lancaster High | X | | |
| | 161 | Bremen High | | X | |
| | 432 | Liberty Union High | | X | |
| | 295 | Pleasantville Local High | | X | |
| Fayette | 126 | Jeffersonville High | | X | |
| Franklin | 431 | Barrett Junior High | X | | |
| | 182 | East High | X | | |
| | 338 | Eastmoor Junior-Senior High | X | | |
| | 103 | Everett Junior High | X | | |
| | 395 | Franklin Junior High | X | | |
| | 243 | Grandview Heights High | X | | |
| | 228 | Linden-McKinley Junior-Senior High | X | | |
| | 139 | South High | X | | |
| | 437 | Canal Winchester Local High | | X | |
| | 136 | Lincoln Gahanna High | | X | |
| | 98 | Madison Local High | | X | |
| | 44 | Marion-Franklin High | | X | |
| | 134 | NAME UNKNOWN (Columbus) Junior-Senior High | | X | |
| | 297 | Grove City High | | | X |
| | 17 | Upper Arlington High | | | X |
| | 128 | Worthington High | | | X |

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Schools Surveyed | | Type of District | | |
|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|-------------------|
| | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
| Fulton | 248 | Chesterfield-Dover High | | X | |
| | 220 | Fulton Local High | | X | |
| | 82 | Gorham-Layette High | | X | |
| | 3 | Swanton Village Local High | | X | |
| | 406 | Wauseon High | | | X |
| Gallia | | | | | |
| Geauga | 341 | Burton-Troy High | | X | |
| | 160 | Kenston High | | X | |
| | 11 | Newbury Local High | | X | |
| | 46 | West Geauga High | | X | |
| Greene | 322 | Cedar Cliff Public High | | X | |
| Guernsey | 105 | Cambridge Junior High | X | | |
| | 427 | Byesville High | | X | |
| | 116 | Quaker City High | | X | |
| | 16 | Madison Cons. | | X | |
| | 114 | Pleasant City Local High | | X | |
| | 349 | Valley Local High | | X | |
| | 397 | Washington High | | X | |
| Hamilton | 67 | Hughes High | X | | |
| | 218 | Mt. Healthy High | X | | |
| | 94 | Norwood High | X | | |
| | 90 | Robert A. Taft High | X | | |
| | 172 | St. Bernard High | X | | |
| | 111 | Washington Junior High | X | | |
| | 225 | Western Hills High | X | | |
| | 52 | Withrow High | X | | |
| | 8 | Wyoming High | X | | |
| | 185 | Anderson High | | X | |
| | 173 | Elmwood Place High | | | X |
| | 362 | Loveland High | | | X |
| | 24 | Madeira High | | | X |
| Hancock | 391 | Findlay Senior High | X | | |
| | 300 | J.C. Donnell Junior High | X | | |
| | 76 | Arlington High | | X | |
| | 70 | Cory-Rawson High | | X | |
| | 425 | Mt. Blanchard Local High | | X | |
| Hardin | 163 | Kenton High | X | | |
| | 32 | Patterson Cooperative High | X | | |
| | 121 | Ada High | | | X |

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|------------------|
| Harrison | 193 | Scio Local High | | X | |
| | 273 | Cadiz High | | | X |
| Henry | 302 | Damascus Township | | X | |
| | 308 | Deshler Public | | X | |
| | 331 | Hamler Local High | | X | |
| | 358 | Ridgeville Local High | | X | |
| Highland | 424 | Greenfield High | | | X |
| Hocking | 325 | Gibsonburg High | | | X |
| Holmes | 119 | Berlin Local High | | X | |
| | 270 | Glermont Local High | | X | |
| | 330 | Killbuck High | | X | |
| | 223 | Nashville High | | X | |
| Huron | 373 | Bellevue High | X | | |
| | 359 | Norwalk High | X | | |
| | 318 | Greenwich High | | X | |
| | 54 | Monroeville High | | X | |
| | 29 | New London Local High | | X | |
| Jackson | 7 | Oak Hill High | | X | |
| Jefferson | 293 | Brilliant High | | X | |
| | 102 | Jefferson Union High | | X | |
| | 230 | Smithfield High | | X | |
| | 277 | Yorkville High | | X | |
| Knox | 409 | Bladensburg High | | X | |
| Lake | 87 | Eastlake Junior High | X | | |
| | 256 | Thomas W. Harvey High | X | | |
| | 357 | Wickliffe High | X | | |
| | 393 | Madison Memorial High | | X | |
| | 62 | Perry High | | X | |
| | 361 | Mentor High | | | X |
| Lawrence | 58 | Windsor High | | X | |
| Licking | 57 | Ben Franklin High | X | | |
| | 110 | Central High | X | | |
| | 254 | Newark Senior High | X | | |
| | 101 | Woodrow Wilson Junior High | X | | |
| | 25 | Alexandria High | | X | |
| | 195 | Burlington Local High | | X | |

TABLE I—Continued

| County | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|------------------|
| Licking (continued) | 305 | Hartford Burlington High | | X | |
| | 232 | Jacksontown High | | X | |
| | 326 | Croton High | | X | |
| Logan | 296 | Bellefontaine High | X | | |
| | 413 | DeGraff Local High | | X | |
| | 192 | West Liberty Local High | | X | |
| | 20 | Stokes Local High | | X | |
| | 257 | Zanesfield Monroe High | | X | |
| Lorain | 366 | Irving Junior High | X | | |
| | 344 | Longfellow Junior High | X | | |
| | 125 | Lorain High | X | | |
| | 276 | Whittier Junior High | X | | |
| | 304 | Avon High | | X | |
| | 298 | Avon Lake High | | X | |
| | 78 | Midview High | | X | |
| | 36 | South Amherst High | | X | |
| | 381 | Amherst Central High | | | X |
| | 289 | Wellington High | | | X |
| Lucas | 363 | Libbey High | X | | |
| | 219 | Maumee High | X | | |
| | 242 | Waite High | X | | |
| | 285 | Scott Evening High | X | | |
| | 282 | Whitney Vocational High | X | | |
| | 284 | Woodward High | X | | |
| | 355 | Anthony Wayne | | X | |
| | 148 | Clay High | | X | |
| Madison | | | | | |
| Mahoning | 339 | C.H. Campbell Memorial High | X | | |
| | 221 | Chaney High | X | | |
| | 42 | East High | X | | |
| | 96 | Hayes Junior High | X | | |
| | 130 | James Hillman Junior High | X | | |
| | 14 | North High | X | | |
| | 436 | Princeton Junior High | X | | |
| | 247 | Rayen High | X | | |
| | 86 | Struthers High | X | | |
| | 10 | Woodrow Wilson High | X | | |
| | 212 | South High | X | | |
| | 187 | Berlin Center High | | X | |
| | 12 | Boardman High | | X | |
| | 231 | Lowellville High | | X | |
| | 387 | McKinley High | | X | |
| | 201 | Poland Seminary High | | X | |

TABLE 1--Continued

| County | Code | Schools Surveyed | City | In a Village | Granted |
|--------|------|------------------|------|--------------|---------|
| Marion | 255 | Taft Junior High | X | | |
| | 112 | Eber ... Junior High | X | | |
| | 291 | Edison Junior High | X | | |
| | 154 | Marion High (Harding) | X | | |
| | 65 | Morral Local High | | X | |
| | 434 | Meeker Local High | | X | |
| | 104 | Claridon High | | X | |
| Medina | 165 | Wadsworth Senior High | X | | |
| | 287 | Brunswick High | | X | |
| | 49 | Homer Local High | | X | |
| | 360 | Lodi High | | X | |
| | 260 | Spencer Local High | | X | |
| | 226 | Wadsworth Centralized High | | X | |
| Meigs | | | | | |
| Mercer | 35 | Celina Public High | X | | |
| | 118 | St. John Local High | | X | |
| | 27 | Rockford Public High | | X | |
| | 352 | St. Henry Local High | | X | |
| Miami | 244 | Piqua Central High | X | | |
| | 127 | Brown High | | X | |
| | 390 | Tipp City High | | | X |
| Monroe | 253 | Antioch High | | X | |
| | 50 | Beallsville High | | X | |
| | 184 | Lewisville High | | X | |
| Montgomery | 200 | Colonel White High | X | | |
| | 412 | NAES ... (Dayton) Junior-Senior High | X | | |
| | 179 | Fairmont High | X | | |
| | 384 | Fairview High | X | | |
| | 393 | Miamisburg High | X | | |
| | 238 | NAES ... (Dayton) Junior-Senior High | X | | |
| | 189 | Germantown High | | X | |
| | 183 | Jefferson Township | | X | |
| | 214 | Northridge High | | X | |
| | 156 | Randolph High | | X | |
| | 9 | Vandalia-Butler High | | X | |
| | 129 | Washington Township High | | X | |
| | 132 | West Carrollton High | | | X |
| Morgan | 239 | Marion Local High | | X | |
| | 161 | Malta-McConnelsville High | | | X |

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Schools Surveyed | | | Type of District | | |
|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|--------|
| | Code | School Name | City | Local | Attempted Village |
| Morrow | 151 | Johnsville High | | X | |
| Muskingum | 288 | Chandlersville High | | X | |
| | 186 | Roseville High | | X | |
| | 181 | Philo High | | X | |
| | 174 | Jefferson Local High | | X | |
| Noble | 26 | Dexter City Local High | | X | |
| | 237 | Caldwell High | | X | |
| Ottawa | 373 | Port Clinton High | X | | |
| | 423 | Danbury Township High | | X | |
| | 336 | Harris-Elmore High | | X | |
| | 382 | Put-in-Bay High | | X | |
| Paulding | 210 | Grover Hill High | | X | |
| | 1 | Paulding High | | | X |
| Perry | 100 | Harrison High (Crooksville) | | X | |
| | 33 | Junction City (Jackson) | | X | |
| | 327 | Thornville High | | X | |
| | 140 | Crooksville High | | | X |
| | 274 | New Lexington High | | | X |
| Pickaway | 329 | Circleville High | | X | |
| | 120 | Darby Township High | | X | |
| | 386 | Jackson Local High | | X | |
| | 328 | Perry Township High | | X | |
| Pike | | | | | |
| Portage | 33 | Roosevelt High | X | | |
| | 313 | Ravenna Local High | | X | |
| | 283 | Aurora High | | X | |
| | 316 | Hiram High | | X | |
| | 85 | James A. Garfield High | | X | |
| | 72 | Southeast High | | X | |
| | 13 | Windham High | | | X |
| Preble | 180 | Camden High | | X | |
| | 389 | Monroe Township Local High | | X | |
| | 66 | West Alexandria High | | X | |
| Putnam | 373 | Columbus Grove High | | X | |
| | 264 | Glandorf High | | X | |
| | 263 | Jennings Local High | | X | |
| | 333 | Kalida High | | X | |
| | 356 | Miller City High | | X | |

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|------------------|
| Richland | 6 | John Simpson Junior High | X | | |
| | 59 | Johnny Appleseed Junior High | X | | |
| | 74 | Mansfield Senior High | X | | |
| | 149 | Ballville Local High | | X | |
| | 131 | Lexington Local High | | X | |
| | 408 | Madison High | | X | |
| Ross | 91 | Chillicothe High | X | | |
| | 416 | Twin High | | X | |
| | 333 | Frankfort High | | | X |
| Sandusky | 41 | Ross High | X | | |
| | 311 | Green Springs High | | X | |
| | 213 | Jackson Local High | | X | |
| | 414 | Woodville Local | | X | |
| Scioto | 202 | Portsmouth High | X | | |
| | 196 | Portsmouth East High | X | | |
| | 146 | Minford High | | X | |
| | 222 | Washington High | | X | |
| | 144 | Valley Local High | | X | |
| Seneca | 133 | Fostoria High | X | | |
| | 400 | Attica High | | X | |
| | 320 | Old Fort High | | X | |
| | 251 | Scipio Republic High | | X | |
| | 275 | Thompson High | | X | |
| | 253 | Tiffin Junior High | X | | |
| Shelby | 217 | Sidney High | X | | |
| Stark | 229 | Alliance High | X | | |
| | 335 | E. James Junior High | X | | |
| | 28 | Lincoln High | X | | |
| | 371 | McKinley High | X | | |
| | 60 | Washington High | X | | |
| | 350 | Canton South High | | X | |
| | 324 | Louisville Public High | | X | |
| | 419 | Middlebranch High | | X | |
| | 433 | Navarre High | | X | |
| | 312 | Northwest Local High | | X | |
| | 379 | Onsburg | | X | |
| | 398 | North Canton High | | | X |
| Summit | 404 | Central High | X | | |
| | 137 | North High | X | | |
| | 147 | Highland Junior High | X | | |

TABLE I--Continued

| County | Code | School Name | City | Local | Excepted Village |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Summit (continued) | 203 | Portage Junior High | X | | |
| | 124 | South High | X | | |
| | 152 | Tallmadge High | X | | |
| | 224 | U. L. Light Junior High | X | | |
| | 88 | Boston High | | X | |
| | 135 | Green High | | X | |
| | 354 | Mogadore High | | X | |
| | 420 | Stow High | | X | |
| | 133 | Twinsburg High | | X | |
| Trumbull | 199 | East Junior High | X | | |
| | 375 | Harry B. Turner Junior High | X | | |
| | 166 | Warren G. Harding High | X | | |
| | 15 | Brookfield Township High | | X | |
| | 405 | Cortland Village High | | X | |
| | 410 | New Bazetta Local High | | X | |
| | 153 | Vienna High | | X | |
| | 21 | Weathersfield High | | X | |
| | 374 | Hubbard High | | | X |
| Tuscarawas | 194 | Dover High | X | | |
| | 191 | Uhrichsville High | X | | |
| | 37 | Baltic High | | X | |
| | 227 | Tuscarawas-Warwick High | | X | |
| | 204 | Wayne Local High | | X | |
| Union | 64 | Northwestern High | | X | |
| Van Wert | 84 | Convoy-Union High | | X | |
| | 292 | Hoaglin-Jackson High | | X | |
| | 117 | Willshire High | | X | |
| | 211 | Wren Village High | | X | |
| | 176 | Van Wert High | | | X |
| Vinton | 422 | McArthur High | | X | |
| | 430 | Wilton Local High | | X | |
| Warren | 428 | Morrow High | | X | |
| | 188 | Lebanon High | | | X |
| Washington | 122 | Lowell High | | X | |
| Wayne | 71 | Orrville High | X | | |
| | 207 | Wooster High | X | | |
| | 45 | Dalton High | | X | |
| | 190 | Norwayne High | | X | |
| | 433 | Rittman High | | | X |

**TABLE I--Continued**

| County | Code | School Name | City | Local | Exempted Village |
|--------|------|-------------|------|-------|------------------|
| Williams | 369 | Bryan High | X | | |
| | 73 | Florence-Edon High | | X | |
| Wood | 48 | Bloomdale High | | X | |
| | 278 | N. Paltimore High | | X | |
| | 294 | Olney High | | X | |
| | 61 | Troy-Luckey High | | X | |
| | 357 | Perrysburg High | | | X |
| | 269 | Rossford high | | | X |
| Wyandot | 347 | Marseilles High | | X | |
| | 342 | Salem High | | X | |
| | 63 | Sycamore High | | X | |
| | 411 | Carey High | | | X |
| UNKNOWN | 280 | UNKNOWN JUNIOR HIGH | | UNKNOWN | |

Appendix C contains four tables of data, by county, on public high school library services in Ohio: Table I, Ratings by 39 Professional Librarians with Clerical Assistants, of Seven Library Services in Public High Schools in North Eastern Ohio by Counties, 1956; Table II, Ratings by 38 Professional Librarians without Clerical Assistants, of Seven Library Services in Public High Schools in North Eastern Ohio by Counties, 1956; Table III, Ratings by 11 Sub-Professional Librarians with Clerical Assistants, of Seven Library Services in Public High Schools in North Eastern Ohio by County, 1956; Table IV, Ratings by 47 Sub-Professional Librarians without Clerical Assistants, of Seven Library Services in Public High Schools in North Eastern Ohio by County, 1956.

[a]Services: I, Instructing in use of library; II, Promoting worthy use of leisure time; III, Helping enrich the curriculum; IV, Centralizing instructional materials; V, Cooperating with inservice training of teachers; VI, Cooperating with the promotion of the school program; VII, Sharing in the cultural life of the community.

A, B, and C rate the performance of these seven services. A, the service extends beyond the minimum requirements; B, service meets minimum needs; C, the service is not offered.

[b]No response.

RATINGS BY 31 PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS AND THEIR CLERICAL ASSISTANTS,
OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES ...
IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO BY ... 1956

| County | School Code | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | A | B | C | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cuyahoga | 27 | A | B | B | A | A | B | b | 3 | 3 | | 1 |
| | 30 | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | 6 | 1 | | |
| | 40 | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | 7 | | | |
| | 47 | A | B | A | B | A | A | B | ~ | 3 | | |
| | 51 | B | b | C | A | C | B | B | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | 69 | B | A | A | B | B | A | B | 3 | 4 | | |
| | 75 | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | | 7 | | |
| | 79 | A | A | A | b | A | A | A | 6 | | | 1 |
| | 107 | B | C | B | b | B | A | b | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | 142 | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | 6 | 1 | | |
| | 153 | B | B | B | H | B | B | B | | 7 | | |
| | 167 | B | C | C | C | A | C | b | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | 175 | A | A | A | b | A | A | A | 6 | | | 1 |
| | 209 | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | | 7 | | |
| | 216 | B | B | B | B | B | A | B | 1 | 6 | | |
| | 235 | A | A | A | b | A | A | B | 5 | 1 | | 1 |
| | 240 | A | B | B | b | B | B | B | 1 | 5 | | 1 |
| | 250 | A | B | B | C | B | C | C | 1 | 3 | 3 | |
| | 265 | b | A | b | b | A | b | b | 2 | | 5 | |
| | 267 | A | B | B | C | C | B | C | 1 | 3 | 3 | |
| | 279 | A | B | A | B | A | A | b | 4 | 3 | | |
| | 281 | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | | 7 | | |
| | 305 | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | | 7 | | |
| | 309 | B | B | B | b | B | B | B | | 6 | | 1 |
| | 364 | B | B | A | C | A | B | B | 2 | 4 | 1 | |
| | 367 | B | B | A | B | A | A | B | 3 | 4 | | |
| | 368 | A | A | A | b | A | A | b | 5 | | | 2 |
| | 370 | B | b | B | b | B | B | b | | 4 | | 3 |
| | 372 | B | B | C | B | B | B | B | | 6 | 1 | |
| | 376 | B | C | A | A | B | B | C | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| | 380 | B | b | b | B | A | B | A | 2 | 3 | | 2 |
| | 402 | A | B | A | b | A | B | b | 3 | 2 | | 2 |
| | 418 | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | 1 | 6 | | |
| | 435 | B | C | B | B | B | B | B | | 6 | 1 | |
| Geauga | 46 | B | C | B | B | B | B | B | | 6 | 1 | |
| | 341 | C | B | A | C | A | C | b | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Mahoning | 247 | B | B | B | B | C | B | b | | 7 | | |
| Richland | 74 | B | C | B | B | b | B | b | | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Trumbull | 166 | A | B | A | A | A | B | ? | 4 | 2 | | 1 |
| Total Schools | 39 | | | | | | | | 53 | 140 | 23 | 27 |

257

RATINGS BY 33 PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS... THEIR CLERICAL ASSISTANTS,
OF SEVEN LIBRARY SCHOOLS... TO... HIGH SCHOOLS
IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO IN... 5, 1955

| County | School Code | 1 | II | III | | | | | | | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ashtabula | 262 | C | B | B | C | b | C | C | | 3 | 4 | |
| Cuyahoga | 18 | B | C | B | C | C | B | F | | 4 | 3 | |
| | 31 | A | B | B | B | A | B | B | 2 | 5 | | |
| | 68 | A | B | A | B | A | A | B | 4 | 3 | | |
| | 106 | B | C | B | B | A | A | B | 2 | 4 | 1 | |
| | 155 | A | B | B | b | b | B | b | 1 | 3 | | 3 |
| | 171 | B | B | A | t | B | B | b | 2 | 4 | | 2 |
| | 429 | A | B | A | B | A | A | C | 4 | 2 | 1 | |
| Erie | 159 | B | C | B | A | B | A | b | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Lake | 361 | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | | 7 | | |
| Lorain | 36 | B | B | C | B | B | B | C | | 5 | 2 | |
| | 125 | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | 6 | 1 | | |
| | 276 | B | b | b | b | b | b | b | | 1 | | 6 |
| | 298 | B | B | B | C | C | C | C | | 3 | 4 | |
| | 344 | B | C | C | C | C | C | C | | 1 | 6 | |
| | 366 | B | b | b | b | b | b | b | | 1 | | 6 |
| Mahoning | 10 | B | B | B | b | b | b | b | | 3 | | 4 |
| | 14 | C | B | C | A | A | C | A | 3 | 1 | 3 | |
| | 42 | B | C | B | b | A | B | B | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | 86 | A | C | B | C | B | B | C | 1 | 3 | 3 | |
| | 96 | B | B | B | b | B | B | B | | 6 | | 1 |
| | 130 | B | B | B | D | C | B | C | | 5 | 2 | |
| | 201 | A | B | B | B | A | A | b | 3 | 3 | | 1 |
| | 212 | A | A | A | C | A | B | B | 4 | 2 | 1 | |
| Medina | 287 | B | C | C | C | B | C | C | | 2 | 5 | |
| Portage | 13 | D | C | B | B | B | B | b | | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| | 33 | B | B | B | B | B | A | B | 1 | 6 | | |
| | 316 | B | B | A | A | A | B | C | 3 | 3 | 1 | |
| Richland | 408 | A | b | b | B | B | B | b | 1 | 3 | | 2 |
| Summit | 6 | A | C | B | B | D | A | B | 2 | 4 | 1 | |
| | 59 | B | B | B | B | D | B | B | | 7 | | |
| | 124 | B | C | C | C | B | B | C | | 3 | 4 | |
| | 137 | A | B | B | B | B | B | D | 1 | 6 | | |
| | 138 | B | C | C | C | b | C | C | | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | 404 | A | B | A | A | B | A | B | 4 | 3 | | |
| Trumbull | 21 | B | C | B | A | B | B | B | 1 | 5 | 1 | |
| | 374 | C | B | C | C | A | B | C | 1 | 2 | 4 | |
| | 375 | A | A | A | b | A | A | A | 6 | | | 1 |
| Total Schools | 33 | | | | | | | | 54 | 127 | 54 | 31 |

APPENDIX C.   TABLE III

RATINGS BY 11 SUB-PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS WITH CLERICAL ASSISTANTS,
OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO BY COUNTY, 1956

| County | School Code | Services | | | | | | | Combined | | | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | A | B | C | |
| Ashtabula | 299 | B | C | B | B | C | C | C | | 3 | 4 | |
| Cuyahoga | 5 | B | C | C | C | B | C | B | | 3 | 4 | |
| | 39 | A | B | B | b | b | C | B | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | 81 | B | B | A | b | b | A | b | 2 | 2 | | 3 |
| | 150 | C | A | B | C | C | C | A | 2 | 1 | 4 | |
| | 233 | A | A | C | C | A | b | b | 3 | | 2 | 2 |
| Erie | 53 | B | B | B | A | A | A | B | 3 | 4 | | |
| Lake | 62 | C | B | B | C | B | D | A | 1 | 4 | 2 | |
| | 256 | B | b | B | B | B | A | B | 1 | 5 | | 1 |
| | 357 | A | B | A | B | B | A | B | 3 | 4 | | |
| Trumbull | 15 | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | | 7 | | |
| Total Schools  11 | | | | | | | | | 16 | 36 | 17 | 8 |

259

APPENDIX C.  TABLE IV

RATINGS BY 47 SUB-PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS WITHOUT CLERICAL ASSISTANTS,
OF SEVEN LIBRARY SERVICES IN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
IN NORTH EASTERN OHIO BY COUNTY, 1956

| County | School Code | Services | | | | | | | Combined | | | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | A | B | C | |
| Ashland | 97 | B | B | C | B | B | B | C | | 5 | 2 | |
| | 439 | B | C | C | C | B | C | C | | 2 | 5 | |
| Ashtabula | 23 | C | b | C | b | b | C | b | | | 3 | 4 |
| | 34 | B | C | B | C | B | B | B | | 5 | 2 | |
| | 163 | A | b | b | b | A | A | A | 4 | | | 3 |
| | 169 | A | B | A | A | B | B | A | 4 | 3 | | |
| | 261 | B | B | C | B | B | B | C | | 5 | 2 | |
| | 323 | B | C | C | C | C | C | C | | 1 | 6 | |
| Cuyahoga | 43 | B | A | B | B | B | B | A | 2 | 5 | | |
| | 177 | C | B | C | b | B | B | b | | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | 234 | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | | | 7 | |
| | 249 | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | 1 | 6 | | |
| | 315 | B | C | B | B | B | A | B | 1 | 5 | 1 | |
| | 319 | B | B | B | A | B | B | B | 1 | 6 | | |
| Erie | 2 | B | C | C | A | A | A | C | 3 | 1 | 3 | |
| | 337 | B | C | B | B | B | B | C | | 5 | 2 | |
| Geauga | 11 | B | C | B | C | B | C | B | | 4 | 3 | |
| Lake | 303 | B | B | A | A | A | B | C | 3 | 3 | 1 | |
| Lorain | 78 | B | B | B | B | B | B | b | | 6 | | 1 |
| | 304 | B | C | B | C | B | C | C | | 3 | 4 | |
| | 381 | B | C | D | b | b | B | b | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Mahoning | 12 | B | C | C | C | C | C | C | | 1 | 6 | |
| | 231 | B | B | B | B | B | B | C | | 6 | 1 | |
| | 339 | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | 1 | 6 | | |
| | 387 | B | B | B | C | B | B | B | | 6 | 1 | |
| | 436 | C | C | A | A | A | B | b | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Medina | 49 | C | B | B | B | B | B | B | | 6 | 1 | |
| | 165 | B | b | b | b | B | b | b | | 2 | | 5 |
| | 226 | A | B | C | A | b | B | A | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 260 | B | B | C | B | B | B | C | | 5 | 2 | |
| | 360 | A | B | B | A | B | B | B | 2 | 5 | | |
| Portage | 72 | B | B | B | A | A | A | B | 3 | 4 | | |
| | 85 | B | B | C | C | B | B | C | | 4 | 3 | |
| | 283 | B | B | A | B | B | B | C | 1 | 5 | 1 | |
| | 313 | C | B | C | B | C | C | C | | 2 | 5 | |
| Richland | 131 | A | B | A | B | A | B | B | 3 | 4 | | |
| | 147 | C | B | B | B | B | C | B | | 5 | 2 | |
| Summit | 88 | A | B | B | B | A | A | C | 3 | 3 | 1 | |
| | 135 | B | b | b | B | B | B | b | | 4 | | 3 |
| | 152 | A | B | A | A | A | A | B | 5 | 2 | | |
| | 203 | B | C | C | C | C | C | C | | 1 | 6 | |
| | 354 | B | B | B | B | B | B | C | | 6 | 1 | |
| | 420 | B | C | B | C | B | B | B | | 5 | 2 | |

APPENDIX C. TABLE IV--Continued

| County | School Code | Services | | | | | | | Combined | | | No Response |
|--------|-------------|---|----|-----|----|---|----|-----|---|-----|----|---|
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | A | B | C | |
| Trumbull | 153 | B | C | C | b | B | C | C | | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| | 199 | B | C | b | B | B | B | C | | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| | 405 | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | | | 7 | |
| | 410 | C | C | C | C | B | C | C | | 6 | 1 | |
| Total Schools | 47 | | | | | | | | 43 | 162 | 98 | 26 |

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE, 1963, FORM II

Name of School_____

Address_____

Name of Principal_____

                               Signature of Principal or
                                 Executive Head

YOUR COMMENTS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS ARE APPRECIATED.

I.   THE SCHOOL'S COMMUNITY
    A.  Enrollment
        1.  Number enrolled in
            a. Grades 7 through 9_____.  b. 10 through 12_____
        2.  % of enrollment gain since 1956, grades 7-12_____
        3.  % of enrollment gain anticipated between 1963 and 1970____
    B.  Present Needs
        1.  Considering the growth and population of your school, the
            total enrollment, the number of teaching and other person-
            nel involved, is your school library adequate for today's
            needs?_____.  Please tell why or why not:_____

        2.  If the predicted enrollment for 1970 is higher than today's,
            what plans should be put into effect to provide adequate
            library service at that time?_____

II.  FACILITIES
    A.  Hours of Service
        1.  How many hours per week is your library open?_____
        2.  How many hours per week is a trained librarian or teacher
            on duty in the library to assist students?_____
        3.  Do you need evening, Saturday or summer hours for adequate
            service?_____ Why?_____
    B.  Quarters
        1.  Is your library space adequate for present needs?_____
        2.  By 1970 will there be sufficient space for accumulating ap-
            propriate reading and non-reading materials for the student
            use in your building?_____
        3.  Is your library a center for all materials of instruction?
            _____
        4.  How many square feet are required for handling non-reading
            materials?_____
    C.  Future Space Needs
        1.  Is it practical to seek other library space such as might
            be made available through a regional student library
            center?_____

263

III. LIBRARY USE
  A. Students
    1. What % of your students use the school library?_____%
    2. What % of your students use the public library for school assignments?_____%
    3. What % of your students use a college library or other libraries or museums for school assignments other than the public library?_____%
       Please describe the kinds of facilities they use_____

  B. Teachers
    1. What % of the teachers use the school library?_____%
    2. Do teachers make optimum use of the school library?_____
    3. Do teachers discuss their needs with the staff of the public library?_____

IV. PERSONNEL
  A. Librarians
    1. Do you have at least one full-time trained librarian in your school? (Minimum of 30 semester hours of library science)_____
    2. Do you have one full-time trained librarian for every 300 pupils?_____
       a. Is more than one trained librarian needed?_____
    3. Are there sufficient funds for hiring a trained librarian?_____
    4. Does the shortage of adequately trained personnel explain any library need that may exist in your school?_____
  B. Clerks
    1. Do you have a sufficient number of clerical assistants in your library to free the librarian for reading guidance, library instruction and other library programs?_____
    2. Do your student assistants perform tasks which also contribute to their education?_____ Please describe briefly what they are:_____

V. PRINTED MATERIALS
  A. Books
    1. How many books per pupil are cataloged in your school library collection?_____
    2. Does your book collection serve the actual requirements of your students and teachers?_____
    3. Have you used paperbacks to reinforce your book collection?_____
       a. Do students purchase paperbacks through your school?___
  B. Magazines, Newspapers and Pamphlets
    1. How many magazine subscriptions does your library receive?_____
       a. Do you have a specific method of handling periodicals which seems highly satisfactory for your school?_____
          If so, please describe briefly:_____
       b. Would there be an advantage in having a library center with a more complete collection of magazines indexed for school use?_____

2. How many newspapers are regularly received? _____
3. How satisfactory is your _____ collection? _____

## VI. AUDIO-VISUAL SERVICES

A. Do you have a separate _____ for handling films, filmstrips, pictures, slides and _____ _____
   1. Is this material used _____ _____
   2. Is this material _____ _____
   3. Could it be circulated _____ effectively through the school library with assistance from an audio-visual staff? _____
   4. What are the advantages in handling this material the way you do? _____

B. Do you participate in a _____ pool? _____
C. Is it practical to circulate ___ or visual aids and equipment, such as speed reading _____, globes and maps, as well as display items and other _____ materials through the school library? _____
   1. If your library gives this service, please describe: _____
   2. Are such materials procured from other sources? _____
   3. What are they? _____

## VII. TECHNICAL SERVICES--BOOK ORDERING, CATALOGING, PROCESSING AND REPAIRING

A. Do you handle details of technical services in your library? ____
   1. Does your library staff perform the work? _____
   2. Is there any help available from the public library or from another source for book ordering, cataloging, processing and repairing which are necessary but time-consuming for your staff? _____
   3. Do you have a contract for service with a nearby public library? _____
   4. Would you be interested in selecting and purchasing materials from a book catalog prepared for school libraries including current materials evaluated by librarians on a continuous basis? _____

## VIII. PROGRAM OF COMMUNICATION

A. What kind of library instruction do you have? _____
   1. Is it adequate to give your students and teachers maximum knowledge of the materials available and the role of the library in your school? _____

B. Do you have exhibits in your school or in your community which are supplied through your library? _____
C. Is there a positive working relationship between the school library and the public library in your community? _____
D. Do your teachers have a systematic method of communicating with the public librarian for maximum service to your students, such as checking in advance on materials available before making assignments? _____
   Please describe: _____
E. Is your community aware of the needs of the school library? ____
   1. Do people know how they can help in a practical way? _____

F. Has there been any direct contact with PTA, with business, industry, or any other community source for outside assistance to improve your budget, to increase interest in a building program, or any other way to foster improvement of library services?_____ If so, please describe:_____
_____

## IX. NEED FOR A BROADER LIBRARY CONCEPT

A. What steps have you, as head of your school, taken during the last year to improve your school library situation?_____

B. Do you see any advantages in closer cooperation among libraries for maximum service to students?_____
   1. Are there any disadvantages which should be noted?_____

C. What suggestions can you make for implementing such an improvement in library service for your community?_____

D. To be certain that a superior school library is not overlooked in this survey, please name an outstanding school library in your area._____


Thank you greatly for your cooperation!

APPENDIX E

A.L.A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOUR SCHOOL LIBRARY, FORM III

## A.L.A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOUR SCHOOL LIBRARY[a]
### October 28, 1963

I BUDGET (Annual)

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| For Regular Library Books | | $4.00 - $6.00 per student | |
| A. Additional funds for: | | Additional funds: | |
| 1. Reference Books | | to meet needs of school | |
| 2. Newspapers & pamphlets | | to meet needs of school | |
| 3. Magazines | | to meet needs of school | |
| 4. Supplies | | to meet needs of school | |
| 5. Rebinding | | to meet needs of school | |
| 6. Audio-Visual Materials | | $2.00 - $6.00 per student | |
| 7. Professional Materials | | $200 - $600 depending on needs | |
| B. Personnel (Salaries) | | Comparable to professional personnel with equivalent training | |

II ORGANIZATION

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. All Materials | | Organized to permit the most efficient use | |
| B. Book Collection | | Professionally classified and cataloged | |
| C. Audio-Visual Materials | | Cataloged | |
| D. Records Kept: | | | |
| 1. Acquisition | | Simple as possible | |
| 2. Circulation | | Simple as possible | |
| 3. Accession and/or Shelf List | | Simple as possible | |

[a]Source: American Association of School Librarians, Standards for School Library Programs (Chicago: American Library Association, 1960), 132 pp.

ORGANIZATION (Continued)

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| E. Discards | | Continuous re-evaluation of collection | |
| F. Rebinding | | Regular consideration | |
| G. Annual Report | | Statistical data collected during year | |
| H. Centralized Facilities | | Needed when 3 or more schools make up system | |

III PERSONNEL

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Librarians | | 1 for each 300 students | |
| 1. Training (Full-time librarian) | | 30 semester hours library science | |
| B. Clerks | | 1 for each 600 students | |
| C. Audio-Visual Coordinators | | 1 for each 600 students | |
| D. Audio-Visual Clerks | | 1 for each 1,200 students | |
| E. Student Assistants | | No substitute for paid clerks | |
| F. Volunteer Helpers | | No substitute for trained personnel | |

IV PRINTED MATERIALS

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Students: 1. Books | | Minimum collection of 6,000; Larger schools, 10 books per pupil K-6, 25; K-8, 50; Jr.H., 70; Sr.H., 120 | |
| 2. Magazines | | | |

PRINTED MATERIALS (Continued)

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Newspapers | | 3 - 6 | |
| 4. Pamphlets | | Extensive collection | |
| B. Teachers: 1. Books | | 200 - 1,000 titles | |
| 2. Magazines | | 25 - 50 professional magazines | |
| 3. Other | | Instructional materials as needed | |

V. EQUIPMENT

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Shelving | | Adequate, standard adjustable shelving; special shelving for magazines, records, etc.; 25 books per foot | |
| B. Tables, Chairs | | Appropriate sizes. See p. ... | |
| C. Card Catalog | | Must be standard library ... | |
| D. Special Equipment | | Book trucks, vertical files, dictionary, atlas stand, typewriter, mechanical copy machines | |

VI. PROGRAM

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Instruction in use of Library | | Continuous, extensive plan developed by principal, teachers, and librarians | |
| B. Class Use | | Library used as an extension of classroom when appropriate | |

PROGRAM (Continued)

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| C. Individual Use | | Library is open to all students and teachers before, during and after the school day | |
| D. Home Loans | | Library resources easily available for home use | |
| E. Classroom Loans | | Continuous short and long-term loans of all types of materials | |
| F. Reading Guidance | | Comprehensive guidance-- joint responsibility of teachers, librarians and [...] | |
| G. Audio-Visual Use | | Students guided in listen-ing and viewing | |
| H. Reference Service | | Library used as a labora-tory for reference and research work by individuals and groups of students | |
| I. Student Assistants | | Organized student partici-pation without exploita-tion | |

VII SPACES

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Reading Room(s) | | Minimum space for 45-55 or 10% of enrollment over 550; 25 square feet per reader | |

STANDARDS (Continued)

| Subject | Our School Library Has | A.L.A. Recommends | Our School Library Needs |
|---|---|---|---|
| B. Sufficient space for:<br>1. Workroom<br>2. Storage<br><br>3. Office<br>4. Listening and/or Audio-Visual Room(s)<br><br><br>5. Conference Room(s)<br><br>6. Classroom | | Sufficient space for:<br>technical processing<br>supplies, 5 years each<br>for periodicals<br>200 square feet<br>Storage, distribution,<br>and repair of mate-<br>rials and equipment;<br>production of mate-<br>rials; listening and<br>viewing<br>1 in schools less than<br>1,000 students<br>Adjoins reading room for<br>library use by class<br>groups | |

APPENDIX F

SOURCES OF 1963 DATA ON OHIO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES

SOURCES OF 1963 DATA ON OHIO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES

| School Code[a] | Schools Surveyed | Type of School | | Type of District | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | JHS | J-SHS | City | Local | Ex. Village |
| **Ashland** | | | | | | |
| 439[c] | Mapleton High[b] | | X | | X | |
| **Ashtabula** | | | | | | |
| 169[c] | Pymatuning Valley[b] | | X | | X | |
| 261[c] | Jefferson High | | X | | X | |
| **Cuyahoga** | | | | | | |
| 27[c] | Bay High | | X | X | | |
| 310 | Brooklyn High | | X | X | | |
| 233[c] | Alexander Hamilton Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 364[c] | Central Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 306[c] | Cleveland Trade (West)[b] | | X | X | | |
| 155 | Frank L. Wiley Jr. | X | | X | | |
| 158[c] | Glenville High | | X | X | | |
| 305[c] | Harding Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 265[c] | John Adams High | | X | X | | |
| 30 | John Hay High | | X | X | | |
| 175[c] | John Marshall High | | X | X | | |
| 266 | Kennard Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 429[c] | Lakewood High | | X | X | | |
| 40[c] | Lincoln High | | X | X | | |
| 171[c] | Maple Heights High | | X | X | | |
| 18[c] | Mayfield High | | X | X | | |
| 69[c] | Myron T. Herrick Junior | X | | X | | |
| 79[c] | Newton D. Baker Junior | X | | X | | |
| 5[c] | North Olmsted High | | X | X | | |
| 372[c] | Parma Senior High | | X | X | | |
| 370[c] | Pleasant Valley Junior | X | | X | | |
| 216[c] | Rawlings Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 250[c] | Roxboro Junior High | X | | X | | |

[a]Responding schools in North Eastern Ohio, 1956, were mailed Form II, the questionnaire on library services, and Form III, a guide to current A.L.A. standards for quality education.

[b]Schools substituted within the same county to represent changes in school name, type of school district and type of school. Data from 71 replies were tabulated.

[c]Libraries evaluated according to A.L.A. recommendations.

APPENDIX F—Continued

| School Code | Schools Surveyed | Type of School | | Type of District | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | JHS | J-SHS | City | Local | Ex. Village |
| **Cuyahoga (continued)** | | | | | | |
| 68[c] | Shaker Heights High | | X | X | | |
| 107[c] | Byron Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 380[c] | Shore Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 235[c] | W.H. Kirk Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 368[c] | William Dean Howells | X | | X | | |
| 106[c] | Willson Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 315[c] | Brecksville High | | X | | X | |
| 43[c] | E.E. Root High[b] | | X | X | | |
| 142[c] | Orange High | | X | | X | |
| 319[c] | Solon High | | X | | X | |
| 435[c] | Warrensville Hts. High | | X | | X | |
| 249[d] | Chagrin Falls High | | X | | | X |
| 234[c] | Westlake High | | X | X | | |
| **Erie** | | | | | | |
| 53[c] | Huron High | | X | | X | |
| 337 | Margaretta High | | X | | X | |
| **Geauga** | | | | | | |
| 11[c] | Newbury Local | | X | | X | |
| 46[c] | West Geauga High | | X | | X | |
| **Lake** | | | | | | |
| 87[c] | Eastlake Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 256[c] | Harvey High | | X | X | | |
| 303[c] | Madison Memorial | | X | | X | |
| 62 | Perry High | | X | | X | |
| 344 | Longfellow | X | | X | | |
| 289 | Wellington High | | X | | | X |
| **Mahoning** | | | | | | |
| 339[c] | Canfield High | | X | | X | |
| 187[c] | Austintown-Fitch High[b] | | X | | X | |
| 12 | Boardman High | | X | | X | |
| 231[c] | Lowellville High | | X | | X | |
| 387[c] | McKinley High (Sebring) | | X | | X | |
| 201 | Poland Seminary High | | X | | X | |

[d]Received after reports were tabulated.

APPENDIX F--Continued

| School Code | Schools Surveyed | Type of School | | Type of District | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | JHS | J-S&S | City | Local | Ex. Village |
| **Medina** | | | | | | |
| 260 | Black River High[b] | | X | | X | |
| 226[c] | Wadsworth Junior High[b] | X | | X | | |
| 165[c] | Wadsworth High | | X | X | | |
| **Portage** | | | | | | |
| 313[c] | Ravenna Local | | X | X | | |
| 38 | Theodore Roosevelt High[b] | | X | X | | |
| **Richland** | | | | | | |
| 59 | Johnny Appleseed Junior | X | | X | | |
| 74 | Mansfield Senior High | | X | X | | |
| 149[c] | Clear Folk Local | | X | | X | |
| 131[c] | Lexington Local | | X | | X | |
| **Summit** | | | | | | |
| 124[c] | South High | | X | X | | |
| 152 | Tallmadge High | | X | X | | |
| 224 | U.L. Light Junior High | X | | X | | |
| **Trumbull** | | | | | | |
| 15 | Brookfield Township High | | X | | X | |
| 153[c] | Mathews (Fowler Vienna) | | X | | X | |
| 199[c] | East Junior High | X | | X | | |
| 375 | Harry B. Turner Junior High | X | | X | | |

APPENDIX G

QUESTIONNAIRE, DECEMBER, 1963, FORM IV

FORM IV
Miss Marion D. Sheil
1190 Belle Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44107

QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARIES
IN OPERATION SIX YEARS OR LESS
December, 1963

Name of School_____
Address_____
Name of Principal_____
                                    _____
                                    Signature of Principal or Executive
                                                                    Head

I. THE SCHOOL'S COMMUNITY
   A. Enrollment
      1. Number enrolled in
         a. Grades 7 through 9_____. b. 10 through 12_____
      2. % of enrollment gain anticipated between 1963 and 1970___
   B. Present Needs
      1. Is your school library adequate for today's needs?_____
         Please tell why or why not:_____

      2. If the predicted enrollment for 1970 is higher than today's,
         what plans should be put into effect to provide adequate
         library service at that time?_____
         _____

II. FACILITIES
   A. Hours of Service
      1. How many hours per week is your library open?_____
      2. How many hours per week is a trained librarian or teacher
         on duty in the library to assist students?_____
         a) Is this adequate?_____
      3. Do you need evening, Saturday or summer hours for adequate
         service? a) Why or why not?_____
   B. Quarters
      1. How many years ago was your school building constructed?__
      2. Is your library a center for all materials of instruction?_
      3. How many square feet are used for handling non-reading
         materials?_____
   C. Future Space Needs
      1. Is it practical to seek other library space such as might
         be made available through a regional student library
         center?_____

III. LIBRARY USE
   A. Students
      1. What % of your students use the school library?____%
      2. What % of your students use the public library for school
         assignments?_____%
      3. What % of your students use a college library or other
         libraries or museums for school assignments other than the
         public library?_____% Please describe the kinds of
         facilities they use:_____

278

B. **Teachers**
1. What % of the teachers use the school library?_____ %
2. Do teachers make optimum use of the school library?_____
3. Do teachers discuss their students' needs with the staff of the public library?_____

IV. **PERSONNEL**
A. **Librarians**
1. Do you have at least one full-time trained librarian in your school? (Minimum of 30 semester hours of library science)_____
2. Do you have one full-time trained librarian for every 300 pupils?_____
   a. Is more than one trained librarian needed?_____
3. Are there funds for hiring one librarian for every 300 pupils?_____
4. Does the shortage of adequately trained personnel explain any library need that may exist in your school?_____

B. **Clerks**
1. Do you have a sufficient number of clerical assistants in your library to free the librarian for reading guidance, library instruction and other library programs?_____
2. Do your student assistants perform tasks which also contribute to their education?_____ Please describe briefly what they are:_____

V. **PRINTED MATERIALS**
A. **Books**
1. How many books per pupil are cataloged in your school library collection?_____
2. Have you used paperbacks to reinforce your book collection?_____
   a. Do students purchase paperbacks through your school?__
B. **Magazines, Newspapers and Pamphlets**
1. How many magazine subscriptions does your library receive?__
   a. Do you have a specific method of handling periodicals which seems highly satisfactory for your school?_____ If so, please describe briefly:_____
   b. Would there be an advantage in having a library center with a more complete collection of magazines indexed for school use?_____
2. How many newspapers are regularly received?_____
3. How satisfactory is your pamphlet collection?_____

VI. **AUDIO-VISUAL SERVICES**
A. Do you have a separate department for handling films, filmstrips, pictures, slides, and other media?_____
1. Is this material indexed in the library?_____
2. Is this material located near the library?_____
3. Could it be circulated more effectively through the school library with assistance from an audio-visual staff?_____
4. What are the advantages in handling this material the way you do?_____

B. Do you participate in a filmstrip pool?_____

C. Is it practical to circulate other visual aids and equipment, such as speed reading machines, globes and maps, as well as display items and other non-reading materials through the school library?_____

    1. If your library gives this service, please describe:_____

    _____

    2. Are such materials procured from other sources?_____

    3. What are they?_____

## VII. BUDGET

A. Number of dollars to be spent this year for:

    1. Books $_____    2. Magazines $_____    3. Newspapers and Pamphlets $_____    4. Rebinding $_____    5. Audio-Visual Materials $_____    6. Professional materials $_____    7. Personnel $_____

## VIII. TECHNICAL SERVICES—BOOK ORDERING, CATALOGING, PROCESSING AND REPAIRING

A. Do you handle details of technical services in your library?

    1. Does your library staff perform the work?_____

    2. Is there any help available from the public library or from another source for book ordering, cataloging, processing and repairing which are necessary but time-consuming for your staff?_____

    3. Do you have a contract for service with a nearby public library?_____

    4. Would you be interested in selecting and purchasing materials from a book catalog prepared for school libraries including current materials evaluated by librarians on a continuous basis?_____

## IX. PROGRAM OF COMMUNICATION

A. What kind of library instruction do you have?_____

    _____

    1. Is it adequate to give your students and teachers maximum knowledge of the materials available and the role of the library in your school?_____

B. Do you have exhibits in your school or in your community which are supplied through your library?_____

C. Is there a positive working relationship between the school library and the public library in your community?_____

D. Do your teachers have a successful method of communicating with the public librarians for the maximum service to your students, such as checking in advance on materials available before making assignments?_____ Please describe:_____

E. Who participated in the planning of your school library? Please check. a. Architect____ b. School Board____ c. Administration____ d. School Librarian____ e. Teachers____ f. Pupils____ g. PTA____ h. Please specify others_____

## X. NEED FOR A BROADER LIBRARY CONCEPT

A. What steps have you, as head of your school, taken during the last year to improve your school library situation?_____

_____

B.  Do you see any advantages in closer cooperation among libraries for maximum service to students?_____  1.  Are there any disadvantages which should be noted?_____

C.  What suggestions can you make for implementing such an improvement in library service for your community?_____

D.  In the interest of best service, what recommendations could you make for effective planning of a new school library?

E.  In your opinion what is the greatest service rendered through your school library?_____

Thank you for your cooperation!

APPENDIX H

SOURCES OF DATA ON NEW HIGH SCHOOLS SINCE 1956

SOURCES OF DATA ON NEW HIGH SCHOOLS SINCE 1956

| County | Schools Surveyed | Type of District | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | City | Local |
| Ashtabula | Edgewood Junior High School | | X |
| Cuyahoga | Moody Junior High School | X | |
| | Midpark High School | X | |
| | Roehm Junior High School | X | |
| | Valley Forge High School | X | |
| | Greenbriar Junior High School | X | |
| | Greenview Junior High School | X | |
| | Bay Junior High School | X | |
| Erie | Perkins High School | | X |
| Geauga | Cardinal High School | | X |
| Lake | South High School | X | |
| | Willoughby Junior High School | X | |
| | Willowick Junior High School | X | |
| Lorain | Admiral King High School | X | |
| | Learwood Junior High School | | X |
| Mahoning | West Branch High School | | X |
| | Poland Junior High School | | X |
| | Volney Rogers High School | X | |
| Medina | Medina Junior High School | X | |
| | Cloverleaf High School | | X |
| Portage | Crestwood High School | | X |
| | Streetsboro High School | | X |
| Richland | Ontario High School | | X |
| Summit | Firestone High School | X | |
| | Stow Junior High School | X | |
| | Tallmadge Junior High School | X | |
| | Nordonia High School | | X |
| | Nordonia Junior High School | | X |
| Trumbull | Chalker High School | | X |
| | Brookfield Junior High School | | X |

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Books

Cecil, Henry L., and Heaps, Willard A. School Library Service in the
United States, an Interpretative Survey. New York: H. W. Wilson,
1940.

Douglas, Mary P. The Pupil Assistant in the School Library. Chicago:
American Library Association, 1957.

Fargo, Lucile F. The Library in the School. Chicago: American Library
Association, 1947.

Smith, Maurice M., Standley, L. L., and Hughes, Cecil L. Junior High
School Education. New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book
Company, Inc., 1942.

## Articles and Periodicals

American Association of School Librarians. "News from the Knapp School
Libraries Project" (Illinois: 1963).

Cohen, Wilbur J., and Lorenz, John G. "Library Services," Health, Edu-
cation, and Welfare Indicators (December, 1962), Library Services
Branch, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Educa-
tion and Welfare, pp. v-xiv.

Ersted, Ruth M. "Some Non-Professional Jobs in the School Library,"
Reproduced by the School Library Development Project, American
Association of School Librarians (Chicago), March, 1962
(Mimeograph), JN 25476.

Fenwick, Sara Innis (ed.). New Definitions of School-Library Service
(Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 90p. (Papers
presented before the Twenty-fourth Annual Conference of the
Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago.)

Grodhaus, David W. "Paper-backs and the High School," Ohio Library As-
sociation Bulletin, XXXIII, No. 2 (April, 1963), 26-23.

Hayes, Margaret. "Evaluating School Library Services," Library Trends,
I, No. 3 (January, 1953), 372-385.

Heinritz, Fred. "Book Versus Card Catalog Costs," Library Resources and
Technical Services, VII, No. 3 (Summer, 1963), 229-236.

Klempner, Irving M. "The Influence of Photoreproduction on Library Operations," Library Resources and Technical Services, VII, No. 3 (Summer, 1963), 244-253.

Lane, Irving E. "An Administrator Looks at the Library," comp., Charles L. Trinkner, Better Libraries Make Better Schools (Contributions to Library Literature #4). Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1962, 335 p., pp. 57-61.

Martin, Lowell. "Lowell Martin's CWC Summary," A.L.A. Bulletin, LVII, No. 8 (September, 1963), 735-741.

Nickel, Mildred L. "Standards and Certification," Library Trends, I, No. 3 (January, 1953), 345-356.

Nolan, Isabel, and Herrick, John H. "What Is the Status of Library Services in Ohio Schools?" Ohio Schools, XXVII (May, 1949), 220-221.

Williams, Elizabeth O. "Teacher Education and the Use of Instructional Materials," Journal of Teacher Education, XII (March, 1961), 104-105.

## Professional Studies and Guides

Aldrich, Frederic Delong. "History of Ohio Public School Library Legislation." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Division of Education, Western Reserve University, 1953.

American Association of School Librarians. Standards for School Library Programs. Chicago: American Library Association, 1960, 132p. Discussion Guide, American Library Association, 1960, 16p.

American Library Association Committee on Post-War Planning of the American Library Association. School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow: Functions and Standards. Chicago: American Library Association, 1945, 43p.

Beachwood Local School District Project-Materials Center, Cleveland 24, Ohio. Not Dated. (Mimeographs.)

Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Evaluative Criteria. Washington, D. C. (The Study, 1939), 1940, 238p.

_____. Evaluative Criteria. Washington, D.C. (The Study, 1950), 1950, 305p.

Eyman, E. M., State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Educational Directory School Year 1955-1956, State of Ohio, Department of Education. Columbus, 22p.

Hand, H. C. Prospectus of the Local Area Consensus Studies. (Circular Series A, No. 51, Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program Bulletin No. 15. Springfield, Illinois.) Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, March, 1951.

Hemms, Frances. "The Evaluation of the School Libraries," National Society for Study of Education: Forty-second Yearbook, Part II, The Library on General Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. 333-349.

_____. A Planning Guide for the High School Library Program. Chicago: American Library Association, 1951, 140p.

Holt, E. E. Educational Directory, School Year 1962-1963. Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Education. Columbus, 250p.

_____. A Guide for Ohio Secondary Libraries. Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Ohio, Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, 269# with Bibliography Guidelines for State School Library Standards. Revised, February, 1962, 24p.

Holt, E. E., and May, Albert C. Laws and Regulations Governing the Certification of Teachers, Administrators, and Supervisors and School Employees in Personnel Service, State of Ohio, Department of Education, Columbus, effective January 1, 1963, 69 p.

Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program. In What Respects Should We Strengthen Our School Library Program? (Consensus Study Inventory B). Springfield, Illinois: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1951.

_____. What Do You Think about Our School Library Program? (Consensus Study No. 6, Inventory A). Springfield, Illinois: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1951.

Kemnon, Mary F., and Doyle, Leila A. Planning School Library Development, a report of the School Library Development Project, American Association of School Librarians. School Library Development Project-1962, American Association of School Librarians, a Division of the American Library Association, a Department of the National Education Association. Chicago: American Library Association, 1962, 89p.

Lohrer, Alice. "The School Library as a Materials Center. Educational Needs of Librarians and Teachers in Its Administration and Use." Proceedings of a Conference under the Auspices of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 16, 17, 18, 1962. Office of Education, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, 20402.

Martin, Lowell A. "Challenge and Opportunity," Students and the Pratt Library. No. 1 in Deiches Fund Studies of Public Library Service, Enoch Pratt Library, Baltimore, Maryland, July, 1963, 68p.

National Education Association, Committee on Library Organization and Equipment. "Standard Library Organization and Equipment for Secondary Schools of Different Sizes," Addresses and Proceedings, LXI (1918), 802p. Washington, D.C.

National Education Association, Department of Secondary Education, Committee on Library Organization. Standard Library Organization and Equipment for Secondary Schools. Albany: University of the State of New York, 1920.

National Education Association Joint Committee. Schools and Public Libraries Working Together in School Library Service. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1941.

National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. Evaluative Criteria, 1960. The author, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 1960, 376p.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. "Policies and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools" (1963-1964), 39p. (Unpublished.)

Ohio High School Standards, 1947. Revised by R. M. Garrison, issued by Clyde Hissong, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Thomas J. Herbert, Governor of Ohio, 111p.

Ohio High School Standards, 1957. Revised by R. M. Garrison, issued by Clyde Hissong, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, The State of Ohio, State Board of Education, Columbus, 116p.

Public Library Association, Committee on Standards for Work with Young Adults in Public Libraries. Young Adult Services in the Public Library. Chicago: American Library Association, 1960, 50p.

Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, H. W. Wilson Company. (A service published semi-monthly, September to June, inclusive; monthly in July and August.) H. W. Wilson Companh, 950 University Avenue, Bronx, New York.

"Report of the Ohio School Survey Committee to the Governor and the General Assembly," Ohio School Survey Committee. Ohio: 1955. 221p.

Responsibilities of State Departments of Education for School Library Services: A Policy Statement. Council of Chief State School Officers. Washington, D.C., 1961, 21p. School Library Development Project, March, 1962, JN 25477.

Rufsvold, Margaret I. "Library Service to Schools in the South Since 1909." Unpublished Masters Thesis, 1933, 128p. The Abstract.

Schick, Frank L., Drennan, Henry T., Mahar, Mary H., and Samore, Theodore. "Assessing the Availability and Accessibility of Resources to Meet Student Needs" (Background Paper Topic 1, 12p. Conference within a Conference. "An Inquiry into the Needs of Students, Libraries and the Educational Process." Chicago: American Library Association, July 16, 17, 18, 1963.

Shera, Jesse H. "Staffing Library Services to Meet Student Needs" (Background Paper Topic 4-No. 2, 7p.) Conference within a Conference. "An Inquiry into the Needs of Students, Libraries and the Educational Process." Chicago: American Library Association, July 16, 17, 18, 1963.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. School-Library Workshop. A Report of the Conference on School and Library Relationships, Columbus, Ohio, was published by The Ohio State Library, Columbus, Ohio, 1946.

Theuer, Arlene A. Public Libraries in Cuyahoga County. Staff Report to Study Group on Public Libraries. Cleveland Metropolitan Services Commission, 1959. 56p.

LIBRARY SERVICES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF OHIO

1955-1963

AN ABSTRACT

by

MARION DORINDA SHEIL

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Education

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

February 1965

# ABSTRACT

In 1956 and in 1963 a comprehensive survey was made of Ohio high
school library services. Librarians provided ratings of services in
terms of materials, staff and facilities, while the principals were con-
cerned mainly with the effects of the library upon the school, and the
relationship of the needs of the library to its services. Trends toward
greater communication and cooperation with other resources, including
public libraries, were noted.

The most significant aspect of the 1956 study concerned the ef-
fect of the library staff upon the services offered. Best services were
afforded in schools which employed professional and clerical library
staff. Seven library services ranked in descending order were: (1) Li-
brary instruction, (2) Inservice training of teachers, (3) Promoting the
school program, (4) Worthy use of leisure, (5) Enriching the curriculum,
(6) Centralizing instructional materials, and (7) Sharing in community
life. In 1956, library budgets were generally adequate in schools with
professional librarians.

The average printed materials budget for Ohio school libraries
which were staffed by professional librarians at least half-time, was
found to be $2.05 per pupil. The best budgets were found in the small
schools.

In 1963, the high school libraries were judged inadequate by
one-third of the principals in one or more of four aspects: (1) poor
equipment and facilities (50.7 per cent), (2) lack of books and related

1

materials (33.8 per cent), (3) shortage of personnel (22.5 per cent), and (4) insufficient funds (11.3 per cent).

The outstanding school library service in 1963 was judged to be the availability of materials for home loans and class loans. Reference service was reported adequate in 98.2 per cent of the schools.

The change of emphasis between 1956 and 1963 was attributed to: (1) the wide acceptance of the improved A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs, and (2) the increased demands upon library resources.

In one-half of the schools, the librarians handled the technical services, such as ordering, classifying, cataloging and repairing materials, although 45 per cent contracted for these services through a public library. Approximately two-thirds of the principals were interested in subscribing to a book catalog to assist with selection, reference, team teaching, etc.

Five recommendations for improving library communications were volunteered by the school men in 1963: (1) positive working relationship with the public library, (2) appropriate exhibits, (3) community information programs, (4) library instruction, and (5) teacher-public librarian cooperation.

Principals who evaluated their libraries according to A.L.A. standards provided more library personnel for their libraries than did Ohio schools in general. One-half of the selected schools had one professional librarian for each 300 students, in contrast to one out of 13 for the larger group. Less than one-half of the Ohio schools (40.8 per cent) reported sufficient clerical help.

Four major improvements were accomplished in Ohio since the 1956 survey: (1) quarters and equipment tended to be more adequate in 10 per

cent of the schools; (2) professional personnel were increased by 60 per cent; (3) interest in the library progressed through community action; and (4) library budgets tripled. Although the improvements were noteworthy, greater needs were indicated than in 1956.

While 63 per cent of Ohio school libraries met the National Standards for printed materials in 1956, only 21.9 per cent met the revised standards in 1963. Moreover, 50 per cent of the libraries lacked the periodicals recommended in the recent standards.