Everhart and I took our seats at the back of the room and waited. The discussion wrapped up, and the chair of the Board of Directors, former West Virginia Governor Bob Wise, invited us to the front of the room to present the revised standards document. Before we spoke, NBPTS staff informed the Board about the process involved in selecting a committee and how the committee works to develop a standards document. Another staff member discussed the results of public comment about the document, and the representative from the Certification Council shared that the Council had unanimously recommended the Board accept the Library Media Standards.

Then it was our turn. Dr. Everhart thanked the NBPTS staff for all of their guidance during the process and described our committee and our five-month writing process, sharing anecdotes and receiving smiles and laughter from the Board of Directors. I continued our presentation by explaining 21st century skills and how our document embodies them, as well as the significant differences between the original standards and our revision. As I spoke, I was pleased to see many of the Board members nodding along in agreement. When I finished, Governor Wise asked for discussion, and the single Library Media Specialist on the Board, Glenda Ritz of Indianapolis, spoke up. She complimented the committee on a fine document, stating that she particularly liked the fact that instruction had been embedded throughout the document, that leadership had been emphasized, and the attention to Technology and Ethics, which are of paramount importance to the field of library media. She announced that she also recommended the standards be accepted. Governor Wise called for more discussion; there was none. He called for a vote, and the Library Media Revised Standards were unanimously accepted by the Board of Directors! Our journey had come to an end.

The standards won't officially be published for a while yet. Their next destination is the Assessment Committee, who will create new National Board assessment exercises to correlate to the new standards. When their work is done, the new standards will be released and future National Board Library Media candidates will use the new document to guide their practice.

If you are interested in helping to effect change at the national level, opportunities to serve are more plentiful than you might think! I urge all of Ohio's talented library media specialists to seek opportunities to effect change in education. Serving on this committee is by far the most valuable professional experience I have ever had. Not only did it allow me to give of myself to the field of library media, but it also afforded me the opportunity to meet influential people from all over the country and left me invigorated and inspired to continue to advocate for quality library media programs and accomplished teaching.

Candi Pierce Garry is a National Board Certified Teacher and is the director of the library media program at Wilson Middle School in Hamilton, Ohio. She earned her Bachelor's degree in Education from Wright State University and her Master's degree in Library Science from the University of Houston. She will begin a doctoral program in Educational Administration at Miami University this fall. She is passionate about school library media programs and their role in educational reform.[

Evaluating Teacher-Librarians:

A Form of Our Own

By Patricia L. Owen, Teacher-Librarian, Eastwood High School, Pemberville, OH.

Introduction

When it comes to appraising the performance of K-12 educators, some teacher-librarians have discovered that a one-size-fits-all approach just doesn't work for them. *Information Power* (American Association of School Librarians 4-5), the traditional manual for teacher-librarians, defines the four roles of the teacher-librarian as teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, and program administrator. Recently, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) published **Empowering Learners: Guidelines for School Media Programs** (American Association of School Librarians 16-17). This new resource reiterates the four traditional roles and adds a fifth: leader. While there's no question that teaching (and student learning) is central to the teacher-librarian's role, as highlighted by the AASL **Standards for the 21st Century Learner**, performance appraisals designed just for classroom teachers are not adequate to evaluate the full range of a teacher-librarian's performance and duties (Bryant 85). Teacher-librarians who are assessed using evaluation tools designed for classroom teachers will find them a poor fit.

Poor Fit

In my school district, this long-standing problem took on new urgency when a Praxis-type evaluation form (Educational Testing Service) was adopted by my local school board for teachers districtwide. This newly-implemented form, adapted from the Praxis III teacher evaluation tool (available for purchase from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) at www.ets.org), evaluates classroom instruction, intervention strategies, and parental contacts rigorously. While an excellent option for classroom teachers, the new form includes evaluation criteria that are not realistically aligned with the teaching role of teacher-librarians and completely ignore the roles of instructional partner, information specialist, program administrator, and leader. For example, the form evaluates a teacher's ability to assess individual instructional progress and intervene when appropriate for all students assigned to their courses. In addition, they are charged with keeping the parents of their students informed consistently over time. Classroom teachers can accomplish these behaviors because they work with the same students daily throughout the school year. However, these evaluation criteria are not easily transferable to the evaluation of teacher-librarians who interact with large numbers of students—in fact, every student in the school. Praxis-type forms also omit the teacher-librarian roles and duties that extend beyond the classroom. For instance, four of the five teacher-librarian roles are not addressed in the newly-implemented Praxis-type evaluation form in my district: instructional partner, information specialist, program administrator, and leader.

The Search

Realizing that the new districtwide classroom teacher evaluation form was a poor fit for me and encouraged by my principal, I searched for a professional evaluation tool that evaluates all five roles of a teacher-librarian and, at the same time, maintains the evaluative rigor of the Praxis-type form adopted by my school district. I began by contacting educators at state departments of education and national educational organizations. First, I found that many state departments of education do not provide a statewide teacher-librarian evaluation form for local district adoption. Of the forms that are available, none were formatted in a Praxis style. They were not based on the five teacher-librarian roles, aligned with local or state academic content standards, or derived from the AASL *Standards for the 21st Century Learner*. My search didn't reveal a national teacher-librarian evaluation form containing these elements either. However, one national organization, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), encouraged me as a National Board Certified teacher-librarian to create a form of my own and share it with my colleagues. NBPTS described the opportunity as a chance for "reflective practice" (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards 31). Knowing that the AASL *Standards for the 21st Century Learner* and *Empowering Learning: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* also encourage self assessment and "reflections on one's own learning," I began to seriously consider creating a form of my own.

Despite having struck out at the state and national level, I pursued an Internet search that revealed a number of teacher-librarian evaluation forms developed by individual school districts. Unhappily, none of the online forms contained all of the desired elements. In fact, none of the forms were constructed as full-model rubrics (see Figure 1) containing Praxis-type evaluation criteria and performance levels, two of the most important elements sought. One form included only headings ("performance criteria," "commendations," and "recommendations for improvement"), but no criteria or performance levels, so this form could give little guidance to school administrators conducting

TERM	DEFINITION
Full-model rubrics	• Include three main elements: criteria, performance levels, and performance descriptions. • Formatted on a grid and used to evaluate performance.
Criteria	• Describe the major elements of a performance. • Included in the left hand column of the grid.
Performance levels	• Indicate the degree to which the performance is successful. • Listed across the top row of the grid.
Performance descriptions	• Describe what the performance of each criterion "looks like" at each level. • Included in the grid cells at the intersection of criteria and performance levels.

Figure 1. Definition of a Full-Model Rubric

teacher-librarian evaluations. Another form listed evaluation criteria ("professional knowledge," "responsibilities," and "relationships"), but used vague performance levels ("satisfactory" or "needs improvement") with no description of what improved performance looked like. Still another form allowed principals to rank teacher-librarians from "1" to "4" for each evaluation criterion, but didn't explain what behavior qualified as a 1, 2, 3, or 4 in each area. Only one full-model rubric-based teacher-librarian evaluation form was located in the Internet search. Unfortunately, this rubric included elements that focused on external subjective opinions of the library program, rather than objective teacher-librarian job behaviors. Lastly, none of the online forms integrated the teacher, instructional partner, information specialist, program administrator, and leader roles.

The Rationale

Because existing evaluation forms did not fit the need, I resolved to create a new teacher-librarian performance appraisal tool. While creating a new tool takes great effort, I had a great resource to use. In a grassroots effort, teacher-librarians throughout Ohio helped to develop K-12 library media academic content standards. These standards articulated both the complex roles of the teacher-librarian and the skills students should achieve as part of the K-12 library experience. Consequently, they were the perfect framework for the evaluation tool.

Creating a new evaluation tool also offered additional benefits. First, I had a chance to engage in self-assessment and reflective practice as well as participate in the process of establishing an evaluation tool in its formative stage. Second, participation in the process allowed me to build library media program advocacy into the assessment tool. Third, this type of appraisal created an opportunity to collaborate with my principal using measurable, objective, evidence-based practices. Finally, during the evaluation process, the principal may become educated about teacher-librarian roles and responsibilities. Although creating a new tool required a substantial effort, the number of secondary benefits expected to evolve provided a strong rationale and reinforced my decision to create a new form.

The Solution – 3 Steps

To create a Praxis-type evaluation form for teacher-librarian performance appraisal, I analyzed the district's newly adopted classroom teacher form carefully, noting the structure and format. Next, I took 3 steps to create a new teacher-librarian evaluation tool.

> 1.   The first hurdle was to identify the content for the new evaluation tool. The Ohio K-12 Library Media Academic Content Standards described the roles of the teacher-librarian; they offered a rich resource for an evaluation tool. Then I reviewed the academic content standards for the appropriate grade level, 9-12. (Because I am located at the high school, my evaluation tool was based on 9-12 academic content standards.)   Next, I consolidated similar standards, benchmarks, and indicators to avoid repetition within the evaluation tool.   Third, I omitted minutia and areas that didn't fit my local context.   For example, students in my school district did not have school email addresses, so standards that describe student email learning outcomes were not included in the evaluation form.   Then, I identified 8 main areas for inclusion in the new form.   Areas 1-7 represented each of the academic content standards (Ohio Department of Education) and Area 8 represented "Teacher-Librarian Professionalism" as defined in the Praxis-type form.

> · Area 1: Library Management
> · Area 2: Collection Development & Curriculum
> · Area 3: Literacy & Reading Support
> · Area 4: Library-based Technology
> · Area 5: Information Literacy
> · Area 6: Technology Literacy
> · Area 7: Media Literacy
> · Area 8: Teacher-Librarian Professionalism

> I created 2-4 evaluation criteria under each area. These criteria are referred to as "components" in my school district's recently adopted Praxis-type evaluation tool.

2.   In the next step, I continued the process by identifying four performance levels for each component: unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and distinguished. Typically, effective rubrics have 3-5 performance levels for each evaluation component. In this case, I selected 4 performance levels to match the local district's classroom teacher evaluation form. By describing teacher-librarian performance at each level, my evaluation form educated school administrators about library media academic content standards and created shared performance expectations. Because the strength of performance level descriptions depended on clear writing, the performance levels were described concretely, concisely, and with a quality focus (Oakleaf 247). They were written using common terminology, consistent (parallel) construction, and clear differentiation between each of the four levels (Oakleaf 247).

3.   Finally, I developed two Praxis-type forms: a rubric and a summative conference form for each of the 8 areas. In order to align my forms with my district's new evaluation process, I mirrored the structure of the classroom teacher evaluation tool.

The Samples

Using the K-12 library media academic content standards, I identified 8 areas. One of the areas, Area 4, focuses on the standard Library-based Technology and consists of four parts. It is shown in detail in Figures 2 and 3.

√   Component 4.1: Provides, integrates, and utilizes library- based technologies to support teaching and learning.

√   Component 4.2: Uses library-based technologies to maintain computers for teachers and students.

√   Component 4.3: Demonstrates the effective usage of library-based technologies.

√   Component 4.4: Develops a virtual school library presence.

Then, I described each component at four performance levels, ranging from unsatisfactory to distinguished. Each level is explained consistently and measurably. For example, for Component 4.1, an unsatisfactory teacher-librarian "does not provide, integrate, and utilize library-based technologies to support teaching and learning," while a distinguished teacher-librarian employs 6 specific techniques to "provide, integrate, and utilize library-based technologies." These techniques include circulating library materials, using Dewey classification to organize materials in MARC format, developing material-lending policies, promoting home access to school OPAC's, facilitating linkages to other library OPAC's, and developing strategies for borrowing from external libraries.

Area 4: Library-based Technology	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
Component 4.1 Provides, integrates, and utilizes library-based technologies to support teaching and learning.	Teacher/Librarian does not provide, integrate, and utilize library-based technologies to support teaching and learning.	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • circulate library materials • use Dewey classification to organized materials in MARC format	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • circulate library materials • use Dewey classification to organize materials in MARC format • develop material lending policies	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • circulate library materials • use Dewey classification to organize materials in MARC format • develop material-lending policies • promote home access to school OPACs • facilitate linkages to other library OPACs • develop strategies for borrowing from external libraries (ILL)
Component 4.2 Uses library-based technologies to maintain computers for teachers and students.	Teacher/Librarian does not use library-based technologies to maintain computers for teachers and students.	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • provide computers • provide internet accessibility	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • provide computers • provide internet accessibility • uphold AUP policy	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • provide computers • provide internet accessibility • develop AUP policy • practice and promote the ethical and responsible use of library technologies

Figure 2. Teacher-Librarian Evaluation Rubric, Area 4, Components 1 and 2

Area 4: Library-based Technology	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
Component 4.3 Demonstrates the effective usage of library-based technologies.	Teacher/Librarian does not demonstrate the effective usage of library-based technologies.	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • provide access to multimedia equipment • facilitate connections with equipment and material lending agencies (ex. NWOET)	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • provide access to multimedia equipment • facilitate connections with equipment and material lending agencies (ex. NWOET) • facilitate linkages to and integration of state e-resources (ex. INFOhio, ODE, ORC)	Teacher/Librarian uses library-based technologies to: • provide access to multimedia equipment • facilitate connections with equipment and material lending agencies (ex. NWOET) • facilitate linkages to and integration of state e-resources (ex. INFOhio, ODE, ORC) • provide inservice on library technologies • assist teachers with the integration of library technologies, internet, and electronic resources into the curriculum • demonstrate technology projects that utilize active learning
Component 4.4 Develops a virtual school library presence.	Teacher/Librarian does not develop a virtual library presence.	Teacher/Librarian does not develop a virtual library presence, but collaborates with school district technology staff to create links to state e-resources and library OPAC on the school district webpage.	Teacher/Librarian creates a school library website with: • remote access • 24/7 access • a connection to the district webpage	Teacher/Librarian creates a school library website with: • remote access • 24/7 access • a link to district page • information about library services, hours, staff, and resources • OPAC access in all buildings • peer-reviewed teacher resource pages • linkages to identified assistive resources

Figure 3. Teacher-Librarian Evaluation Rubric, Area 4, Components 3 and 4

Figure 4 offers an example of the summative portion of the teacher-librarian evaluation form for one of the eight areas, Area 4, Library-based Technology. This form mirrors a similar section of my district's classroom teacher evaluation tool and provides my school administrators with a short version of the longer rubric for their summative comments. It provides the framework for the meeting between a teacher-librarian and the principal. It summarizes the evaluation and becomes part of the professional development record.

Form D: Summative Conference Form

Staff Member: Evaluator:

Current Position:

Pre-Observation Conference Date: New Teacher:

Observation Date(s):   Limited Contract:

Post-Observation Conference Date: Continuing Contract:

Area 4: Library-based Technology	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Distinguished
Component 4.1 Provides, integrates, and utilizes library-based technologies to support teaching and learning.				
Component 4.2 Uses library-based technologies to maintain computers for teachers and students.				
Component 4.3 Demonstrates the effective usage of library-based technologies.				
Component 4.4 Develops a virtual school library presence.				

Evaluator Comments:

Component 4.1:

Component 4.2:

Component 4.3:

Component 4.4:

Teacher Comments Regarding Components:

Figure 4: Teacher-Librarian Summative Form. Area 4. Components 1-4

The Evidence

My new evaluation form provides an evidence-based framework for evaluation of teacher-librarian performance. Using my form as a guide, teacher-librarians can create paper and/or electronic portfolios of evidence to document their work performance. Some of my example documents are included in Figure 5.

EVIDENCE	EXAMPLE DOCUMENTS
Library Web Site	Screenshots, research skills tutorials, database links, web site statistics
Lessons	Student orientations, collaborative instructional units, information literacy one-shots
Schedules	Class visits, scope & sequence
Parental Contacts	Open houses, emails, newsletters, phone calls, communication logs, parent-teacher conferences
Student Assessments	TRAILS, worksheets, SurveyMonkey.com results
Student-Created Products	PPTs, interactive board presentations, spreadsheets, timelines, Works Cited pages, book reports/talks, CDs
Policy & Procedure Manual	Table of contents, mission statements, collection policies, strategic plans
Student Library Activities	Photos, videos, locally-created READ posters
Appreciation	Thank you letters, awards/acknowledgements, school board recognition
Promotional & Event Materials	Contests, fliers, bookmarks, bulletin boards, local/student newspaper articles
Professional Development	Library conference session descriptions, certificates of attendance, college transcripts, college courses taught, NBCT certification

Teacher & Staff Training	Checklists, job descriptions, inservice agendas, survey feedback, 21st Century Learning Commons "Things"
Equipment & Technology Access	Sign-out sheets, safety tips, AUPs, 24/7 library web site, circulating laptops
Resource Access	Library web site, inter-library loans, professional shelf holdings, video streaming, INFOhio databases, e-books
Budget	Annual reports, grant proposals, sample budgets
Usage Statistics	Circulation reports, attendance counts, web site statistics, resource usage surveys
Assessment	Needs surveys, program evaluation, library advisory committee
Reading Literacy & Advisory	Reading lists, book clubs, displays, book talks, visiting authors

Figure 5. Examples of Documents That Demonstrate Teacher-Librarian Performance

This evidence of teacher-librarian performance can be maintained and periodically updated in a print or electronic portfolio.

Conclusion

Teacher-librarians can take documentation, including their evidence-based portfolio, to the evaluation meeting with their principal. Using the portfolio as a guide, the principal and the teacher-librarian focus on measurable, objective, evidence-based practices of the library media program. Future program and professional goals grow from these conversations.

Teacher-librarians need evaluation forms that fit their unique roles and responsibilities and acknowledge both the similarities and differences between classroom teachers and teacher-librarians. The incorporation of academic content standards, the use of a Praxis-type format, and reliance on AASL standards provide a solid framework for building an effective evaluation tool. Such tools allow teacher-librarians to demonstrate the value of their programs using evidence-based documentation in conversations with their principals. In fact, teacher-librarians can use this measurable, objective, evidence-based approach to advocate for their school library media programs. Reflective teacher-librarians welcome the opportunity to participate in the creation of a tool that achieves these multiple goals.

Works Cited

American Association of School Librarians. *Empowering Learning: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs*. Chicago: American Library Association. 2009.

American Association of School Librarians. *Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1998.

American Association of School Librarians. *Standards for the 21st Century Learner*. Chicago: American Library Association. 2007. Accessed 4 July 2009. www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/guidelinesandstandards/ learningstandards/AASL_Learning_Standards_2007.pdf.

Bryant, Miles. "The Role of the Principal in the Evaluation of the School's Library Media Specialist." *School Libraries Worldwide*, 8.1 (2002): 85-91.

Educational Testing Service. *Overview of the Praxis III Tests.* 2008. Accessed 4 July 2009. www.ets.org

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. *NBPTS Library Media Standards*. 2001. Accessed 4 July 2009. www.nbpts.org/userfiles/File/ecya_lm_standards.pdf.

Oakleaf, Megan. "Dangers and Opportunities: A Conceptual Map of Information Literacy Assessment Approaches." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 8.3 (2008): 233-253.

Ohio Department of Education. *Ohio Guidelines for Effective School Library Media Programs.* 2003. Accessed 4 July 2009. www.ode.state.oh.us

Patricia Owen (NBCT) is a teacher-librarian at Eastwood High School in Pemberville, OH, and can be contacted at powen.bex.net

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION