



Shaping Literacy Project

Quapaw Public Schools: Evaluation Summary Revised

November 16, 2009

Oklahoma Technical Assistance Center
123 E. Broadway
Cushing, OK 74023
www.otac.info

OTAC
alternate paths to learning

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Evaluation Design	2
Evaluation Matrix	3
Implementation	6
Table 1. Proposed items, acquisition status and verification.	7
Table 2. Summary of patron library usage, number of item checked out, and mean usage by patrons.	11
Table 3. Comparison of the number of teachers accessing particular resources.	12
Table 4. Attendance rates for project sponsored professional development sessions. . .	15
Table 5. Survey responses to Guided Reading Management professional development session.	16
Table 6. Survey responses to Teaching Novels professional development session.	17
Table 7. Survey responses to DIBELS professional development session.	17
Table 8. Survey responses to Guided Reading Techniques professional development session.	17
Table 9. Survey responses to Guided Reading Leveled Readers professional development session.	18
Table 10. Resources accessed by the after-school tutoring program.	20
Table 11. DIBELS score results.	21
Table 12. Instructional Recommendation by grade level.	22
Table 13. Instructional Recommendation for special instruction students.	23
Conclusion	24
Figure 1. End- of- Project Objective/Activity Implementation Level	24

Shaping Literacy Project
Quapaw Public Schools: Evaluation Summary Revised
Oklahoma Technical Assistance Center
November 16, 2009

This report is a brief summary of the evaluation activities which occurred for Quapaw Public School's Shaping Literacy Project (SLP). SLP was a one-year project awarded by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Program, administered through the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, and funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended, Title I, Part B, Subpart 4; 20 *U.S.C.* 6383.

Quapaw Public Schools is a rural district located in the northeast corner of Oklahoma. According to the Oklahoma Office of Accountability's *District Report Cards 2008*, during the 2007-08 school year, the district served 674 students. Of these, 308 were enrolled in the elementary school which served grades EC-5. Eighty-one percent of these students were enrolled in the federal Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Also, based on the states' Reading Sufficiency requirements, 25 percent of first through third graders were below grade level in reading and received remediation services.

The district housed two libraries, one at the elementary school and the other at the secondary school. The secondary school library was also used by the district's middle schools students. One certified Library Media Specialist managed both libraries with help from student aides and two assistants. The elementary school library's print collection held, before this project, 7,836 books with an average copyright date of 1970. The average reference material copyright was 1980.

On Friday, May 10, 2008, around five o'clock in the evening, a particularly large tornado hit the elementary school. The Shaping Literacy Project grant was written before the tornado struck but the grant award was timely for Quapaw Public Schools. The SLP allowed the Elementary School Library an opportunity to replace damaged and destroyed resources and update an obsolete and worn collection of reference materials and books.

The SLP chose the National Library Power program as a model for updating the elementary school library. The National Library Program suggests that school library collections need to be balanced, relevant, current, and linked to the curriculum. Further, this program proposes that a library collection include enough books for a ratio of 15 books per one student. This model was also congruent with current research showing that reading scores tend to rise with larger library collections and school-wide networks that extend access to collection resources. (Lance and Loertscher, 2003). The Shaping Literacy Project was designed to comply with the National Library Power program and current research. The projects' activities were based on three basic components, (1) acquire needed library resources to bring collections up-to-date including print and technology items, (2) provide professional development to teachers so new resources would be integrated into classrooms, and (3) provide greater access to the library through extended hours and parental outreach.

The primary goal of the Shaping Literacy Project was *to improve the media center at the elementary school*. Six objectives were listed as the means of meeting this goal.

- Acquire up-to-date school library media resources, including books.
- Acquire and use advanced technology incorporated into curricula of the school.
- Facilitate Internet links and other resource-sharing among school, public, and academic libraries.
- Provide professional development described in section 1222(d)(2).
- Provide students with access to school libraries during nonschool hours.
- Improve reading skills of students.

This report will summarize the degree to which each of the project objectives were implemented and document any slippage that may have occurred. It will also examine the program's success in attainment of the primary goal.

Evaluation Design

The purpose of the federal Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Program was to *improve literacy skills and academic achievement of students by providing students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and resources*. Two GPRA requirements were defined as evaluation measures to determine a project's success of meeting the program's purpose. The GRPA requirements were to

1. Improve the literacy skills of students served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries program.

Measure 1.1 The percentage of schools/districts served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.

2. Enhance the school library media collection at grantee schools/districts to align with curriculum.

Measure 2.1 The difference in rate of increase between the participating schools and nonparticipating schools.

The GPRA requirements were incorporated into the Shaping Literacy Project's goals and objectives. The following evaluation matrix outlines project objectives, activities, performance measures, and methods of analysis for each measure.

Evaluation Matrix			
Objective	Activities	Measure	Analysis
Acquire up-to-date school library media resources, including books.	Increase the number of quality books (copyright less than ten years old) from 3.13 to 10 per student Purchase 2,400 new books	Pre-post library collection inventory sorted by genre Acquisition records Comparison of acquisition rates with control school	Quantitative analysis (frequency counts, percentages, descriptive and inferential statistics)
Increase nonfiction circulation by 25%.	Purchase nonfiction books.	Pre-post patron usage reports Pre-post circulation report by genre	Quantitative analysis (frequency counts, percentages, descriptive and inferential statistics)
Acquire and use advanced technology incorporated into curricula of the school.	Purchase 12 MacBook Laptops 1 ELMO Sagebrush peripherals (book inventory and checkout scanners)	Participant Survey Circulation reports Purchase records On-site observations	Qualitative analysis Quantitative analysis (frequency counts, percentages, descriptive and inferential statistics)
Facilitate Internet links and other resource-sharing among school, public and academic libraries.	Increase links with Miami Public Library, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College Library	Participant Survey On-site observations	Qualitative analysis
Provide 20 hours of professional development.	100% of K-3 teachers and LMS will participate in a minimum of 20 hours of professional development	Dates, times, agendas, and attendance records of professional development sessions Professional development satisfaction surveys	Quantitative analysis (frequency counts, percentages, descriptive and inferential statistics) Qualitative analysis

Evaluation Matrix			
Objective	Activities	Measure	Analysis
Provide students access to school libraries during nonschool hours.	<p>Extend library availability by two hours a week for 32 weeks during the school year</p> <p>Extend library availability during the summer academy by 12 hours per week for four weeks</p>	<p>Circulation reports for after-school tutoring program</p> <p>Attendance logs, and agendas for Family Literacy Nights</p> <p>Circulation records for summer school</p>	Quantitative analysis (frequency counts, percentages, descriptive and inferential statistics)
Improve students' reading skills.	<p>Provide students with reading specialist and after-school tutoring.</p> <p>Decrease the number of intensive or strategic readers in grades K-3 by 5%</p> <p>Decrease the number of students below satisfactory in reading for grades 3-5 by 3 %</p>	<p>DIBELS scores</p> <p>OCCT Research and Information Standard</p>	Quantitative analysis (frequency counts, percentages, descriptive and inferential statistics)
The difference in rate of increase between participating schools and nonparticipating schools.	Compare library acquisition rates with like school	<p>Circulation reports</p> <p>Purchase records</p>	Quantitative analysis (frequency counts, percentages, descriptive and inferential statistics)

The Shaping Literacy project had two challenges to overcome to meet these objectives: a limited performance period (one year) and tornado damage that kept the elementary school closed until October 2008. The silver lining, according to project personnel, was that due to the tornado, necessary technology, print collection, and furniture acquisitions had been determined in the early summer of 2008, before the grant was awarded. The early planning allowed project personnel to proceed with implementation immediately upon receiving funding. Following is a timeline of project activities.

August 2008

Grant Awarded

September 2008

Begin data collection
 Coordinate professional development
 Prepare for Family Literacy Nights
 Student testing

September and October 2008	Reopen library Acquire library resources Finalize technology purchases
October 2008 - May 2009	Provide professional development Acquire print and technology resources Link to public libraries, academic libraries, Discovery Education Streaming, and Grolier Online Extend library hours After-school tutoring
June 2009	Extended summer school hours
July - August 2009	Complete final report

The evaluation design was modeled on the Stake Model (Ohio State), using data regarding: 1) starting conditions, 2) procedures, and 3) results. A feedback loop from outcomes to intents allowed for immediate decisions to modify or cancel any function or activity. The evaluation provided information: 1) regarding the extent to which objectives were being reached and/or modified; 2) by which decisions were made as the continuation, modification or elimination of various procedures and activities; and 3) upon which others base decisions regarding the use of the Shaping Literacy Project as a model project.

The project evaluation set out to answer the following questions:

1. Did the project's activities meet the project timeline?
2. Were project objectives implemented as planned?
3. What barriers impeded progress to implementation?

Working together, evaluators and project staff determined evaluation measures to assess goal attainment. These measures included both quantitative and qualitative tools. Quantitative analyses measured increases in student achievement on standardized assessments and examined pre-post library circulation records including teacher usage of library resources, and circulation rates. Qualitative measures were developed to gain insights into participants' experiences with the project. To ensure a responsive evaluation plan, quarterly meetings between evaluators and project staff to share internal and external data analyses were set. The project was responsible for data collection and the evaluation team was responsible for analyses and reporting the data. A description of the evaluation measures used follows.

Student Outcome Database. A database was created by the Oklahoma Technical Assistance Center to record student demographic, academic, and testing data. Demographic data collected included students' age, ethnicity, and Free/Reduced Program membership. Academic data focused on the students' grade, the number of after-school tutoring sessions, and sessions with Quapaw's reading specialist. Two types of testing data were gathered. Pre/post benchmark scores for the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) were collected for 1st through 5th grade students. Also, results of the questions addressing the state's Research and Information standard on the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests. Assessment data on this standard was collected for Quapaw Elementary students in grades 3 through 5.

Participant Survey. A brief survey was developed to gauge teacher responses to the Shaping Literacy Project (See the Appendix for a copy of the Teacher Survey.) The survey required teachers to respond to six open-ended questions concerning their use of library resources and perceptions of the project. The survey was administered late in the school year.

Observations. Evaluators conducted four on-site visits to the Quapaw Elementary School Library. These quarterly visits provided opportunities to observe the acquisition of technology and print resources. They also offered time to discuss the progress of goal attainment and address any potential barriers to implementation.

Project Documentation. Several documents were collected from project personnel. Agendas, attendance, and participant satisfaction surveys were collected for all project sponsored professional development activities. Circulation records were collected to gauge resource acquisition and usage. Attendance and agendas were collected for each of the project- sponsored family literacy events. These documents were analyzed for participant engagement and satisfaction with project services.

Implementation

The purpose of the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Program was to help LEA's improve students' literacy skills by providing up-to-date print and technology resources for a designated library. Quapaw chose to focus on the district's elementary school library for their Shaping Literacy Project because the collections needed to be updated and the reading skills of 25 percent of the school's 1st through 3rd graders were below grade level.

The project had three strands of activity which incorporated all of the project objectives. The first activity strand acquired up-to-date print and technology resources for the Quapaw Elementary School Library. The second strand provided professional development to elementary school teachers to help them integrate the new resources into their classrooms. The third activity strand conducted outreach to students and teachers by extending library hours and to parents and guardians through Family Literacy Nights. Each activity strand complemented and supported the other and all strands were implemented simultaneously. The ultimate outcome of these efforts was to help students become better readers as assessed on standardized tests. The following section describes the implementation of each activity strand.

Acquisitions

The district's Reading Sufficiency Plan Committee proposed the library acquisitions for this project. The main purpose of this group was to determine methods to improve students' reading skills. Members of this committee included parents, teachers, the library media specialist, the elementary school principal, and the district test coordinator. It was with this committee's support and guidance that the Shaping Literacy Project was developed.

The committee suggested two areas in which to make purchases to update the elementary library: (1) print and (2) technology. The print collections, as noted above, were worn and out of date. The library's technology resources were too few to serve the whole school and many of the technologies were also out of date.

The grant proposal outlined the committee’s suggestions in the number and genres of books to be purchased and the technology resources to be acquired through this project. The grant proposal called for the purchase of 2,400 print titles, with an emphasis on nonfiction books, instructional material for teaching reading, and updating reference materials. The technology resources to be purchased included LeapPad Learning Systems, laptop computers, audio visual equipment for the library, and a new library circulation system software and hardware.

Verification of purchased items was conducted through visual inspection, circulation reports, and review of project purchase documentation. Types of purchase documentation included circulation reports, purchase orders, and the project director’s budget narrative with purchase notations. Visual verification occurred during three quarterly site visits. The first site-visit focused on the evaluation plan and evaluation measures. Part of the second and third site visits were spent in the library reviewing and observing acquisitions. The entire fourth site visit was spent in the library conducting a visual check for randomly selected books for which there were purchase records. Table 1 outlines the proposed library items to be purchased, their acquisition status, and verification of acquisition.

Table 1. Proposed items, acquisition status and verification.			
Instructional Learning Technology			
Proposed Item	Acquisition Status	Verification	
		Visual Verification	Document Verification
30 LeapPad Learning Systems	Purchased	✓	✓
5 DVD/CD/Cassette Listening Centers	Purchased	✓	✓
13 MacBook Pro Laptops	Purchased	✓	✓
Laptop Cart	Purchased	✓	✓
Digital Camcorder	Purchased	✓	✓
17 ELMO Document Camera*	Purchased	✓	✓
Sony VHS/DVD player/recorder	Purchased	✓	✓
37" LCD Monitor	Purchased	✓	✓
Library Infra-structure Technology			
In-Hand Inventory Unit for Sagebrush Info Center	Purchased	✓	✓
Marc Source (Sagebrush) InfoCenter software	Purchased	✓	✓
Ceiling Mounted Electronic Screen	Purchased	✓	✓
LCD Projector	Purchased	✓	✓
Color Laser Printer	Purchased	✓	✓

Table 1. Proposed items, acquisition status and verification.			
Online Licenses and Agreements			
Discovery Education Streaming	Purchased	✓	✓
Grolier Online	Purchased	✓	✓
Miami, Oklahoma Public Library	Access Permitted	✓	✓
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College Library	Not Accomplished		
Print Acquisitions			
Reference Material: World Book Encyclopedia, Almanac Set, Thesaurus Set, Atlas Set, Dictionary Set	Purchased	✓	✓
Accelerated Reader Quizzes	Purchased	✓	✓
Reader's' Theater Grades 1-6	Purchased	✓	✓
K-2 Comprehension Strategy Poster Set with Leveled Texts	Purchased	✓	✓
K-6 Startup Phonics Skill Bag Sets	Purchased	✓	✓
High Frequency Word Vocabulary Kit	Purchased	✓	✓
K-2 Big Book Sets, Nonfiction & Fiction: Math, Science, and Social Studies	Purchased	✓	✓
Nonfiction K-6 Science Standard Set Leveled Books 25 titles (6 of each title)	Purchased	✓	✓
Nonfiction K-6 Language Arts Standard Set Leveled Books 25 titles (6 of each title)	Purchased	✓	✓
Nonfiction K-6 Social Studies Standard Set Leveled Books 25 titles (6 of each title)	Purchased	✓	✓
Nonfiction K-6 Math Standard Set Leveled Books 25 titles (6 of each title)	Purchased	✓	✓
2,400 Library Books	Purchased	✓	

* Originally, the grant called for one ELMO to be purchased. Savings accrued throughout the project enabled the purchase of 16 additional ELMOs to be used in the 2009-2010 school year. The federal program officer approved this purchase.

Some items that were purchased through the project were not proposed in the grant. For example, a Nystrom Social Studies Globe Cart was purchased and often used by Quapaw Elementary faculty. The above list should be considered a guide to the most important acquisitions to made through the project rather than a complete inventory of purchases.

Of the above items, which were described in the grant, one resource was not acquired and another did not meet the two source verification process. Access to Northeastern Oklahoma

A&M College Library, in nearby Miami, Oklahoma, was not accomplished. When evaluators inquired why the link had not been established, no clear answer could be provided. Also, verification of book purchases could not be definitively established. Visual inspection indicated that books had been purchased but documentation could not reinforce the visual inspection.

The intent of evaluators was to conduct a random visual inspection of new materials. This was conducted with the assistance of the library media specialist and the library aide. Library staff pulled books that were randomly selected from invoices. This same procedure would be replicated using the library's inventory produced through the Sagebrush InfoCenter circulation system. A random set of books was selected from purchase orders and the inventory was searched to verify the books' presence in circulation records. The visual check occurred but a second verification through project and school documents (library circulation records) could not be conducted.

Visual inspection. On the fourth site visit, a visual inspection of books was conducted. Using invoices provided by the library media specialist as a master list of purchases, a random sample of 100 books was drawn. The number 70 was used as the selection interval. This number was produced by the website <http://www.randomnumber.org>. After four hours, 94 percent of the random sample had been located.

Six books from the random sample could not be found. Circulation records for five of these books indicated that they were in the library. Four of these books were highly popular children's stories including: *Who's in Love with Arthur*, *Arthur's Back to School Day*, *Climbing Cat*, and *Cave Bears*. These five books may have been misplaced while being shelved. The library relied on student aides to shelve books. Also, the *Arthur* books were narrow with call numbers on the front rather than the spine making it easy to misplace if the worker was in a hurry or not paying close attention. It was also possible that elementary students removed one of these books from the shelf, looked at the book, and then returned it in another place. The fifth book was listed in computerized circulation records but could not be found on the shelf. The only identifier for this book was an abbreviated title, *Meet. . .Peacocks*.

The sixth and last book that could not be located was *Hyenas*. It was not in the library's circulation records and it could not be found on the shelves. Another title from the random sample of books was not entered in circulation records but was found on the library shelves. The book was part of a National Geographic class set that was one of the K-6 leveled science book series purchased. The library media specialist found the book on the shelf with the other class sets. Library staff could not offer an explanation why the National Geographic book had not been added to the library inventory and circulation records.

Inventory and purchase invoices. The plan for the second verification measure was to use the elementary school library's inventory. Another set of randomly selected books would be drawn and the inventory would be checked for the presence of the random titles. The Sagebrush circulation software could only produce an inventory for all Quapaw libraries, nor did the inventory have identification markers to denote to which library collection a book belonged. After further discussion, evaluators believed that if the inventory could provide an alphabetical list of the libraries' collections that this would be adequate for verifying the purchase of the 2,400 books proposed in the grant proposal.

Evaluators received the Quapaw Library inventory at the end of June of 2009. No purchase of library resources was made after this date and it was assumed that all acquisitions would have been entered into the inventory by this time. The goal of examining the inventory was to verify a random sample of the 2,400 books purchased by the project. Also, if possible, evaluators would determine the genre of the books purchased. An important component of the Shaping Literacy Project was to increase the number of nonfiction books in the elementary school collections.

The inventory contained 20,414 entries with 20 variables describing information about each entry. Inventory variables included title, author, call number, copy id, ISBN, copyright, location, price, fund through which the resource was purchased, copy type, LCCN, date acquired, public note, private note, ISSN, subtitle, vendor, vendor URL, Accelerated Reader point value, and Accelerated Reader reading grade level. Of these variables, only the acquisition date was recorded for each inventory entry.

For the purpose of examination, only those items that were purchased during the project were selected from the original inventory. The inventory revealed that 3,829 items were acquired for Quapaw libraries between September 2008 and June 2009. According to the inventory's *copy type* data, 2,436 of the 3,829 items were books, 96 items were electronic equipment, 256 items were coded as professional, 202 items were coded as elementary inventory and the remaining 839 items were coded as secondary school. It is not known what kind of resources were purchased for those items coded as professional, elementary inventory, and secondary school. For this reason, the exact number of books in the inventory could not be determined.

The inventory was also reviewed to determine where the new materials were housed. The results indicated that 3,723 of the entries were not coded for location. Of the remaining 106 items that did have a code, 86 items were coded as located in the elementary, eight were coded as LSLGRAN (Library Shaping Literacy Grant) and 12 were coded as belonging in the secondary school library.

The inventory also allowed for each entry to be coded by the entity that provided the funds for the acquisition. Inventory records indicated that 518 items were purchased with funds provided by with the Shaping Literacy Project. Inventory records indicated that 19 items were books, 249 items had been coded as professional, 92 as equipment, 117 items as elementary, and 41 as secondary school. Numerous strategies were employed to determine the exact number of books in the inventory without success.

One final effort was made to identify books purchased by the project. Evaluators obtained purchase orders of the books purchased through the Shaping Literacy Grant. Using these purchase orders, evaluators entered LG, which stood for Library Grant, into the funding variable of entries on the time-limited inventory. Several pages of purchase order documents were not included in the documents provided to evaluators. Also, not all purchase orders listed every title in the book order. This approach to identifying project purchased books could not be completed due to incomplete information.

It was ultimately determined that insufficient data was obtained to verify the number and genre of books purchased through Quapaw’s Shaping Literacy Project. Being unable to discern the number and genre of books purchased by the project also impacted another project objective. The SLP hoped to increase circulation of nonfiction books by 25 percent at the elementary school. With only a district inventory and no library identifier, it could not be discerned how many nonfiction books were purchased by the project and whether circulation of nonfiction books had increased at the elementary school library.

A third source of acquisition verification presented itself in the circulation reports of Quapaw patrons’ usage of library resources. Patrons in this case referred to Quapaw’s elementary school faculty. Faculty patron records could not verify the number of books purchased by the project, but they did provide evidence of increased use of library resources. These circulation records reported each item a teacher, teaching assistant, school counselor, etc., checked out of the library for the entire school year. Patron usage records were also collected for the year prior to the project, 2007-08. Comparing 2007-08 library usage patron usage to 2008-09 usage demonstrated the impact of Shaping Literacy Project on Quapaw elementary school faculty.

The patrons’ usage reports were presented to evaluators as Adobe files. Evaluation staff calculated the number of patrons reported on the circulation records and the items checked out by each. Table 2 summarizes the patrons’ usage records by year; it also provides the number of patrons using the library, the number of and type of library resource used, and the mean number of patrons using that resource.

Table 2. Summary of patron library usage, number of item checked out, and mean usage by patrons.				
2007-08 Faculty Patrons = 23 2008-09 Faculty Patrons = 22	Frequency of item check out		Mean usage of item by patrons	
	2007-08	2008-09	2007-08	2008-09
Laptop Computers	0	1068	0.00	49.00
Leap Pad Learning Systems	11	687	0.50	31.00
Leap Pad Books	3	768	0.13	35.00
Books	1,220	1,995	53.00	91.00
Reading Instructional Materials: Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Comprehension Sets, Reading/Activity Sets	7	664	0.30	30.00
Listening Center	8	76	0.35	3.50
ELMO	0	82	0.00	3.70
TV/VHS/DVD Cart	11	31	.50	1.40

Quapaw Elementary School employs approximately 18 certified teachers each year. The patron usage circulation records included teaching assistants, the school counselor, and the

library media specialist. Not all teachers used the same type of library resources. The mean number an item was used represents trends in usage rather than individual patron’s usage.

In comparing patrons’ usage records from 2008 to 2009, it would appear that a dramatic increase in patron usage of library resources occurred. A new administrative policy regarding library resources may account, in part, for the appearance of increased usage. In 2009 teachers were required to return library resources at the end of each day unlike the previous year when teachers could check out material for an unspecified length of time. This policy increased usage volume but may not indicate a diversity of resources in the classroom. For example, one teacher checked out the same set of nine books two days in a row. Prior to the one-day check out policy these nine books would have been counted as nine library resources checked out by one teacher. With the one-day check out policy in place, these same nine books were counted as 18 library resources used by a single teacher.

Greater availability of resources added to greater diversity of resources being used. In 2007-08, the Quapaw Elementary School Library collection had reading instruction sets called “hanging bags.” The purpose of these bags was to provide a students with a book and activities that promoted students’ practice with literacy skills. With this project, reading instructional resources expanded to include materials on the five phases of reading development, phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency. Patron usage records indicated a 99 percent increase in usage of reading instructional materials. Even with the one-day check out policy, the use of reading instructional materials by teachers increased.

New to the library in 2008-09 were 13 laptop computers and an ELMO. The laptop computers and the ELMO were popular resources. There was no comparative date by which to compare usage of these resources but the data presented in this report may be used as a baseline for usage of laptop computers and the ELMO.

The number of patrons accessing particular types of resources from the library did increase. Table 3 presents the number of patrons in 2007-08 and 2008-09 and the resources they used. This Table further reinforces the belief that patrons increased the number of library resources they used in their classrooms. Laptop computers and the ELMO are not included in this list because they were not available to library patrons in 2007-08.

Table 3. Comparison of the number of teachers accessing particular resources.		
Resource Center	Number of Patrons Accessing Resource	
	2007-08	2008-09
LeapPad Learning Systems	4	10
LeapPad Books	3	8
Books	16	20
Reading Instructional Materials: Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Comprehension Sets, Reading/Activity Sets	4	13

Table 3. Comparison of the number of teachers accessing particular resources.		
Resource Center	Number of Patrons Accessing Resource	
Listening Center	1	6
TV/VHS/DVD Cart	6	8

When the number of LeapPad Learning Systems was raised from 25 to 55, through this project, the item became more available for teachers to use. In 2008-09, 60 percent more teachers accessed this resource. Availability also increased the usage of reading instructional materials. During 2007-08, four teachers used the “hanging bags” available compared to 13 teachers in 2008-09. The number of patrons using books from the library increased by 20 percent in 2008-09.

An Adobe printout of teacher usage was the source that evaluators used to calculate patron usage. Some variance may exist between this calculation and the actual inventory. However; proceeding with caution, it appeared that Quapaw Elementary Faculty accessed library resources in larger numbers during the 2008-09 school year compared with the 2007-08 school year.

Participant Survey. During the last week of school, the Participant Survey was administered to Quapaw’s elementary school faculty. Faculty came to the library during their planning periods and were handed the survey by an evaluator. Faculty members could remain in the library or return to their rooms to complete the survey; upon completion the survey was returned to the evaluator. The school principal announced the procedure over the intercom system. Eleven of the 21 possible respondents completed the survey for a completion rate of 52.38 percent. The library media specialist was not administered the survey because she was part of the project; thereby, reducing the number of faculty members by one from the 22 cited earlier in this report.

The purpose of the survey was to elicit respondents’ perceptions of the Shaping Literacy Project. Particularly, the survey asked if faculty used the library resources and how they used those resources in learning activities. The survey further inquired whether the professional development sessions had been beneficial in their efforts to implement new resources in their classrooms. It also asked whether faculty perceived barriers to using the library and how the library could be improved.

As far as using the new library resources, all respondents reported that they did use new resources in the library and in their classrooms. All of the items proposed in the grant, and others not proposed, were cited as being used by Quapaw faculty. The library resources listed as used included laptops, books, magazines, videos, phonics lessons, ELMO, TV cart, Nystrom Social Studies cart, listening centers, teacher resource books, encyclopedias, Readers’Theater, Discovery Education, Leap Pads and Leap Pad stories, fluency kit, reference materials, Blurt game, the new series on presidents and historical people, comprehension connections and guided book reading books.

The majority of respondents, eight of 11, reported that they assigned students research projects to be conducted in the library. Research was done for individual reports, class projects, and extensions of instructional units. Also mentioned was the class taught weekly by the library media specialist on literacy and library skills.

The circulation records of patrons' library usage and Participant Survey responses indicated that Quapaw faculty had increased their use of the library and library resources. The use of all library resources appeared to have increased, but in particular was the increase in reading instructional materials.

Comparison Site Information. Was the Quapaw Elementary School able to purchase more resources as a consequence of this grant than a comparable school using state and local resources? This was an important question to federal funders. Project personnel chose to compare their library acquisitions with the nearby district of Fairland. This district was chosen by project personal because established working relationships between the districts would allow efficient sharing of district information.

Fairland Public Schools is located in the northeast corner of Oklahoma. According to Oklahoma's Office of Accountability's *District Report 2008*, Fairland Elementary School enrolled 392 students in grades EC-5. Sixty-two percent of these students were enrolled in the federal Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Also, 28 percent of 1st through 3rd grade students were in need of reading remediation. Quapaw's Elementary School was smaller with an enrolment of 308 students in grades EC-5. Quapaw students had a higher participation rate in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program, 81 percent. Quapaw and Fairland had a comparable number of students in grades 1 -3 in need of remediation services; Fairland had 28 percent and Quapaw 25 percent.

The state of Oklahoma provides funding for libraries based on student enrollment. For schools with less than 500 students, the state provides \$9.00 per student to be used toward library resources. Additionally, districts sponsor book fairs and other events to help raise funds for their libraries. During the 2007-08 school year, Fairland spent, as reported to evaluators by Shaping Literact Project personnel, \$13.13 per student for Fairland's Elementary School library materials. Fairland's enrollment of 392 students would yield a library budget of \$5,146.96.

Using the project director's budget worksheet, a total of \$73,014.72 was spent on library resources that would be used by students and teachers. Items included on this worksheet were books, technology, reading resources, and CDs. Library furniture and circulation software were not included in the above total. With the Shaping Literacy Project grant funds, Quapaw Elementary School was able to spend \$237.06 per student for library resources. Quapaw's per pupil expenditure for library resources was 94 percent larger than Fairland's per pupil expenditure.

Professional Development Activity

The professional development activities of the Shaping Literacy Project were delivered throughout the performance year and presented simultaneously with acquisition activities. This approach kept teachers focused on implementing the new library resources as they were being

acquired throughout the year. The project chose to train elementary faculty in the Guided Reading Program as its primary focus of professional development. The Guided Reading Program was aligned with PASS standards. Guided Reading workshops would potentially increase teachers' skills for teaching reading and would also encourage teachers to incorporate new library acquisitions into the classroom. The Guided Reading Program also complemented the Accelerated Reading Program already implemented in the elementary school.

Project sponsored professional development activities began after the elementary school library reopened in October of 2008. Sessions were offered in October, December, January, February, and May. Three sessions, those offered in October, February, and May addressed the Guided Reading Program. The three Guided Reading sessions focused on management of the guided reading process, techniques of guided reading, and using leveled reading material. Two more pertinent professional development sessions were offered by the Shaping Literacy Project, Reading Novels and a presentation of the elementary school's Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skill (DIBELS) data. The DIBELS assessment was used at by the Quapaw Elementary School to assess students' reading achievement.

Staff members of the Center for Effective Schools at the University of Oklahoma presented the Guided Reading and Reading Novels workshops. The Center for Effective Schools provides school improvement models, guidance, and professional development to schools throughout Oklahoma. The project director, who was also the district test coordinator, presented the DIBELS data to the elementary faculty. Also, book publishers provided professional development to accompany product purchases.

Professional development attendance records provided to evaluators indicated that twenty faculty members attended workshops. Of these twenty faculty, 17 were teachers, and the remaining three were the elementary school principal, library media specialist, and the school counselor. Attendance records of the professional development sessions showed that attendance ranged from a low of five participants at the Teaching Novels workshop to 20 at the Guided Reading and publisher sessions. The mean attendance for project sponsored professional development was 14.6 participants. Table 4 summarizes attendance data and attendance rates for project sponsored workshops.

Name of Professional Development Session	Number of Faculty Members Attending	Percent of Faculty in Attendance
Guided Reading Management	13	65%
Teaching Novels	5	25%
DIBELS Data Review	16	80%
Guided Reading Techniques	18	90%
Guided Reading, Leveled Readers	12	90%
Guided Reading	11	55%
Guided Reading (Two day workshop)	11	55%

Table 4. Attendance rates for project sponsored professional development sessions.		
Teacher Database	20	100%
Bigby Books	20	100%
Nystrom Company	20	100%

The Teaching Novels workshop was targeted toward the fourth and fifth grade teachers, those who could implement information from this workshop. This workshop had the lowest attendance rate. The Teacher Data Base workshop and the publisher sessions were the most highly attended workshops. These sessions had perfect attendance rates. The majority (80%) of the Quapaw elementary faculty attended three or more professional development sessions offered. No faculty member attended all of the workshops presented. Satisfaction surveys were not provided for the Guided Reading , Guided Reading (Two day workshop), Teacher Database, Bigby Books and Nystrom Company.

Faculty satisfaction surveys were administered after each professional development session. The survey asked participants to respond to four questions:

1. The information presented will be beneficial in teaching in the classroom.
2. The presenter was knowledgeable about the information and was able to answer questions about the topic.
3. A follow-up workshop would be beneficial.
4. All equipment, materials and supplies were made available.

Respondents could choose one of three responses to these questions: *Helpful*, *Some Help*, and *Not Helpful*. Sixty-one completed surveys were provided to evaluators. Tables 5 - 9 summarizes survey responses for each workshop.

Table 5. Survey responses to Guided Reading Management professional development session.						
PD session participants = 13 Survey Respondents = 9	Helpful		Some Help		Not Helpful	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The information presented will be beneficial in teaching in the classroom.	9	100%	0	0.00	0	0.000
The presenter was knowledgeable about the information and was able to answer questions about the topic.	9	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
A follow-up workshop would be beneficial.	9	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
All equipment, materials and supplies were made available.	7	78%	0	0.00	2	22%

Table 6. Survey responses to Teaching Novels professional development session.						
PD Session Participants = 5 Survey Respondents = 6*	Helpful		Some Help		Not Helpful	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The information presented will be beneficial in teaching in the classroom.	6	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
The presenter was knowledgeable about the information and was able to answer questions about the topic.	6	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
A follow-up workshop would be beneficial.	4	67%	2	33%	0	0.00
All equipment, materials and supplies were made available.	6	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00

* Attendance records were incomplete.

Table 7. Survey responses to DIBELS professional development session.						
PD Session Participants = 16 Survey Respondents = 16	Helpful		Some Help		Not Helpful	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The information presented will be beneficial in teaching in the classroom.	16	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
The presenter was knowledgeable about the information and was able to answer questions about the topic.	16	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
A follow-up workshop would be beneficial.	13	81%	1	6%	2	13%
All equipment, materials and supplies were made available.	15	94%	0	0.00	1	6%

Table 8. Survey responses to Guided Reading Techniques professional development session.						
PD session participants = 18 Survey Respondents = 18	Helpful		Some Help		Not Helpful	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The information presented will be beneficial in teaching in the classroom.	17	94%	1	6%	0	0.00
The presenter was knowledgeable about the information and was able to answer questions about the topic.	18	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
A follow-up workshop would be beneficial.	17	94%	1	6%	0	0.00
All equipment, materials and supplies were made available.	17	94%	1	6%	0	0.00

Table 9. Survey responses to Guided Reading Leveled Readers professional development session.						
PD session participants = 12 Survey Respondents = 12	Helpful		Some Help		Not Helpful	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The information presented will be beneficial in teaching in the classroom.	9	75%	3	25%	0	0.00
The presenter was knowledgeable about the information and was able to answer questions about the topic.	12	100%	0	0.00	0	0.00
A follow-up workshop would be beneficial.	9	75%	3	25%	0	0.00
All equipment, materials and supplies were made available.	10*	90%	1	10%	0	0.00

* One respondent did not answer this question.

A total of 61 satisfaction surveys were provided to evaluators. These surveys represented 94 percent of all professional development participants. Of these 61 surveys, the *not helpful* response was marked five times. The *not helpful* response was marked three times for the question: *All equipment, materials and supplies were made available*. Two participants marked this response option for the Guided Reading Management session and one did so for the DIBELS review session. Two participants marked the *not helpful* response to the *Follow-up would be beneficial* question for the DIBELS review session. Overall, the Quapaw faculty appeared satisfied with the project-sponsored professional development.

The Participant Survey administered by evaluators the last week of school also addressed teachers’ perceptions of the project sponsored professional development. The Participant Survey asked:

Did any of the professional development sessions you attended this year assist your use of library resources? Please describe.

Two categories of responses emerged from answers to this question. The first category referred to professional development aimed to train teachers how to use new library resources. The second category referred to professional development focused on classroom pedagogy. Representative responses from each category will be presented below.

Those survey respondents that found the sessions focused on pedagogy, which would have been the sessions described above (Guided Reading Management, Teaching Novels, DIBELS Review, Guided Reading Techniques, and Guided Reading Leveled Readers), offered positive statements about these workshops. For example, responses in this category included:

- *The workshop gave us an alternative to seat work during reading groups.*
- *We had a workshop on using novels in the classroom. We got some good ideas.*

Many survey respondents referred to training on how to use new library resources in their answers. Approximately half of these respondents found this type of training beneficial. As one participant wrote, *We have had several workshops using our new material and they were helpful.* Two library resources, in particular, were commented upon in responses, the Nystrom Globe cart and Comprehension CDs. The Nystrom Globe cart contained globes, trade books, and technology to teach geography. The comprehension CDs helped students improve reading comprehension. Representative statements in this category of responses included:

- *Yes, the activity cart–how to use! Comprehension skills–how to use!*
- *Yes, activity Globe Cart–how to use material.*
- *Comprehension CDs-how to use.*
- *Yes, the Nystrom man gave us insight on how to utilize the books, globes, atlases, etc, in our daily lessons.*
- *Yes gave me in depth knowledge of resources and provided ideas for use.*

The other half of responses in the “how to” category did not find these professional development sessions to be helpful. One respondent wrote, *[It] would have been nice to have better explanation of new materials and how to use them.* Other statements in this category included:

- *Did not really help.*
- *No. We needed someone to show us how to use the things. It took too long to figure it all out.*

Most survey respondents referred to the “how to” workshops. Information about these professional development sessions was not provided to evaluators. It may have been that the vendors sponsored these workshops and they were not considered to be sponsored by the project.

According to the grant proposal, the project was to have sponsored 20 hours of professional development to 100 percent of the Quapaw Elementary School faculty. In early discussions with project staff, each faculty members’ staff development form was to be provided for review. The staff development form included the participants name, date and name of professional development session, the number of hours earned for attending the session, and the satisfaction survey. These forms were not provided, however; according to project records, 32 hours of project sponsored professional development was provided participants.

Outreach activities

The third strand of project activities was extending the library hours and increasing the number of patrons of the Quapaw Elementary School library. The library extended its hours during the school year to remain open and provide access to resources to the after-school tutoring program. The library also served the summer school program during June 2009. To reach a broader audience, four family literacy nights were planned and designed to introduce the library and its resources to students’ parents and guardians.

Extended library hours focused on a voluntary tutoring program conducted at the elementary site. A letter was sent to the parents/guardians of all elementary students identified as reading below grade level inviting their students to participate in the no-cost tutoring program. Tutoring sessions were held four days a week, Monday through Thursday for one hour after school, 3:30 - 4:30. Classroom teachers served as the tutors. Students chose to attend one or two sessions a week. Student-teacher ratio was kept small, tutors worked with between one and five students at a time. The program began in October, after the library had reopened and ran through the end of April. Approximately 48 students enrolled in the tutoring program.

Tutors accessed the library for resources. The circulation records did not have a time stamp that would have allowed project personnel and evaluators to know which program had checked out a particular resource. To track resources used by the tutoring program, the LMS kept hand-written notes counting material used by tutors. These records are summarized them in Table 10.

	Books	Laptops	ELMO	BLURT Game	Fluency Kit	SS Globe Cart	Readers' Theater	Leveled Readers
October	35	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
November	78	42	8	0	0	0	0	0
December	39	39	4	0	0	0	0	0
January	82	85	4	0	3	0	0	0
February	91	62	0	4	6	0	1	0
March	43	32	0	2	0	1	4	0
April	49	59	0	3	0	1	7	4

Books and computers were the most consistently used resources for tutoring. The ELMO was used during the first semester but not the second. This pattern suggests that teachers were learning to use the ELMO during the first semester but abandoned it as a tutoring tool during the second semester. During the second semester, BLURT and Readers' Theater were both employed by tutors.

The after-school tutoring program was available for 22 weeks during the 2008-09 school year. This was approximately 88 days of tutoring and extended library hours. This met the project objective to extend library hours 64 hours during the school year.

The elementary school library was open during summer school in June 2009. The library was open four days a week, four hours a day, for five weeks, or 80 hours. This met the project objective to extend library hours by 48 hours during summer school. Records provided to evaluators showed that the LMS was present and checking out resources during summer school. Records of library resources used during the summer school were not provided for review.

The project offered four family literacy sessions to introduce students' parents to the library and its programs. Documentation for four family literacy evenings was provided to

evaluators. The first family literacy night was held in conjunction with parent-teacher conferences in mid-October 2008. Parents met in the library and the elementary school principal explained the after-school tutoring program. The second family literacy event was in November, the week before Thanksgiving. Families met in the cafeteria. A brief presentation was made describing the library's online resources. Families then proceeded to their students' classroom for a read-a-loud. The project reported that 66 parents attended. The third family literacy event was in March and celebrated Dr. Seuss' birthday. Each class had a station for families to visit and engaged in an activity correlated with a Dr. Seuss book. According to project reports, 270 parents attended this event. The final parent evening was held in May, two weeks before the end of school. This event was coordinated to coincide with a book fair. Clifford the Big Red Dog attended and according to project records 200 students, parents, and guardians attended.

Outcomes

Demographic and academic data was provided on 199 students who attended Quapaw Elementary School during the 2008-09 school year. The students ranged in grade level from 1-5. Student ethnic data indicated that the make up of Quapaw Elementary was somewhat similar to the state as a whole (Profiles 2008, Oklahoma Office of Accountability). Caucasian students accounted for the majority of students (48.7%) followed by Native American students (47.7%), African Americans (1.5%), Hispanics (1.5%), and Asian American students (0.5%). The percentage of Native Americans was more than twice that of the state average of 19 percent. Students' eligibility for the Free or Reduced Lunch Program was also collected as a measure of socioeconomic status. More than two-thirds (71.9%) of the elementary students qualified for the program.

DIBELS. Scores from Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) were collected for 1st through 5th grade students during the year. The reading skills assessment was administered three times during the year and the students' instructional recommendation was recorded for each of the areas assessed. An instructional recommendation of Benchmark (at grade level), Strategic (needs additional intervention) or Intensive (needs substantial intervention) was recorded for each student in each of the following subtest: Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency, Oral Reading Fluency, and Instructional Recommendation. The following table presents a comparison of the first and last administration of the assessment by subtest.

Subtest	Intensive			Strategic			Benchmark		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
Phoneme Segmentation	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	73.8%	100.0%	100.0%
Nonsense Word	8.2%	12.8%	0.0%	16.5%	43.6%	13.5%	75.3%	43.6%	86.5%
Oral Reading	31.8%	19.2%	15.1%	26.6%	26.4%	23.7%	41.6%	54.4%	61.3%
Instructional Recommendation	27.3%	20.7%	15.1%	25.3%	25.4%	23.7%	47.4%	53.9%	61.3%

Overall, the project appeared to have met its objective of improving students' reading skills. Examination of the data indicated that 73.8 percent of the students were on grade level in the area of Phoneme Segmentation Fluency at the beginning of school while all were on grade level by the end of the year. Nonsense Word Fluency was the area with the smallest increase; however, none of the students had ratings in the intensive category by the end of the school year. A substantial gain was also noted in the percentage of students who functioned on grade level in Oral Reading Fluency. By the end of the year, 61.3 percent of students were on grade level compared to 41.6 percent at the beginning of the year. The percentage of students who scored in the Intensive range decreased by half. The overall Instructional Recommendation for students also suggested improvement during the year. A substantial decrease was noted in the percentage of students who scored in the Intensive range while the Strategic category continued to account for approximately a quarter of students. The percentage of Quapaw students who were reading at grade level increased from 47.4 percent to 61.3 percent.

Additional analyses of the Instructional Recommendation indicated that 12 of the 186 students that participated in the DIBELS assessment scored significantly lower by the end of the year compared to their first assessment. The majority of students, 124 reported no change in the Instructional Recommendation and 50 students increased their reading skill during the year.

The program's objective stated that the results of intervention would *decrease the number of intensive or strategic readers in grades K-3 by 5%*. Table 12 presents the Instructional Recommendation by grade level. Those grade levels that did meet the objective target are highlighted. Only the 1st grade failed to meet the target in at least one of the categories. A large percentage of the 1st grade students scored on grade level (64.9%) at the first of the year. The second assessment of the 1st grade students may be a more accurate assessment of skills.

In the 2nd grade, a substantial decrease in those students requiring additional assistance was noted in both the Intensive recommendation and the Strategic recommendation. At the 3rd grade, a substantial percentage of students moved from Intensive to Strategic level. The greatest change between the first and third administration was noted in the 4th grade data where 51.4 percent were reported to need Intensive assistance compared to 17.1 percent by the end of the school year. Fifth grade data indicated reliable decreases in both Intensive and Strategic categories. The greatest improvement in reading skills appeared to be at the 4th and 5th grades.

Grade Level	Intensive			Strategic			Benchmark		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
1 (N=37)	13.5%	21.6%	18.9%	21.6%	29.7%	35.1%	64.9%	48.6%	45.9%
2 (N=41)	17.1%	14.6%	9.8%	39.0%	12.2%	24.4%	43.9%	73.2%	65.9%
3 (N=34)	29.4%	20.6%	20.6%	23.5%	26.5%	35.3%	47.1%	52.9%	44.1%
4 (N=35)	51.4%	22.9%	17.1%	11.4%	31.4%	11.4%	37.1%	45.7%	71.4%
5 (N=39)	28.2%	25.6%	10.3%	30.8%	28.2%	12.8%	41.0%	46.2%	76.9%

Examination of just those students in grades 1-3 (112 students) suggests that the objective was not achieved. Of this group, 19.6 percent scored in the Intensive range on the first assessment compared to 16.1 percent at the end of the year, a 3.5 percent decrease. On the Strategic level, 28.6 percent fell in this category at the first of the year compared to 31.2 percent on the third administration.

The student data also included the number of sessions students attended with the district’s reading specialist. Fifty-seven students in grades 1-3 were reported to have attended the sessions. The mean number of sessions per student was 78.91 and ranged from 16 to 120. Table 13 presents the Instructional Recommendation for those students who participated in the additional reading instruction. Some progress was noted in the percentage of students who moved from the Intensive to the Strategic range by the end of the year. Approximate half of the students fell in the Strategic range and a substantial increase was noted in the percentage of students who were working on grade level (23.3%) by the end of the year. Chi-square analyses suggested that the amount of exposure the child had to instruction was not a significant factor in a change in level on the DIBELS. It is more likely that many factors contributed to an increase in students’ skills.

Table 13. Instructional Recommendation for special instruction students.									
	Intensive			Strategic			Benchmark		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
Instructional Recommendation	28.6%	29.8%	21.4%	57.1%	38.6%	55.4%	14.3%	31.6%	23.2%

Federal Performance Measures. Two GPRA requirements were defined as evaluation measures to determine a project’s success of meeting the program’s purpose. The first GRPA requirement focused on the improvement of literacy skills and was measured as *the percentage of schools/districts served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students*. According to Oklahoma’s District Report Cards, an Academic Performance Index (API) score of 914 is required to meet the state target for reading achievement. In 2008-09, Quapaw Elementary’s reading API was 914 and the reading API for 2008-09 was also reported to be 914. It should be noted that during 2008-09 school year, Oklahoma implemented changes to the state’s assessments that resulted in lower scores for most districts. In fact, the state declared that 2008-09 was a “hold harmless” year in terms of progress so that the adjustments could be completed. With this in mind, it is likely that Quapaw’s reading scores would have been higher without the adjustments.

The second measure addressed the alignment of the school’s library media collection and the curriculum and required examination of *the difference in rate of increase between the participating schools and nonparticipating schools*. As reported earlier, the comparison site was reported to have spent \$13.13 per student for library materials compared to Quapaw who averaged \$237.06 per student during the project year. This information suggests that the measure was met.

Conclusion

The ultimate goal of the Shaping Literacy Project was to increase Quapaw Elementary School students' reading achievement by increasing the number of print and electronic resources in the school library. As reported in the grant narrative, research has shown a correlation between students' reading achievement and libraries with a diverse collection of up-to-date books. To further nurture increased reading skills, teachers were trained in Guided Reading techniques as an instructional vehicle to integrate the library's new resources into Quapaw Elementary School classrooms.

Eight objectives and accompanying activities were outlined in the grant. Implementing these objectives and activities were the blueprint for attaining the project goal. Figure 1 describes the stage of attainment of each objective at the end of the project.

Figure 1. End-of-Project Objective/Activity Implementation Level		
Objective	Activity	Implementation
Acquire up-to-date school library media resources, including books.	Increase the number of quality books (copyright less than ten years old) from 3.13 to 10 per student Purchase 2,400 new books	Partial Implementation Data submitted by project could not verify the complete implementation of this project objective.
Increase nonfiction circulation by 25%.	Purchase nonfiction books	Partial Implementation Data submitted by project could not verify the completion of this project objective.
Acquire and use advanced technology incorporated into curricula of the school.	Purchase 12 MacBook Laptops 1 ELMO Sagebrush peripherals (book inventory and checkout scanners)	Implemented Patron circulation records indicated an increased usage of technologies provided through the Quapaw Elementary School library.
Facilitate Internet links and other resource-sharing among school, public and academic libraries.	Increase links with Miami Public Library, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College Library	Partial Implementation An Internet link with Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College Library was not established.
Provide 20 hours of professional development.	100% of K-3 teachers and LMS will participate in a minimum of 20 hours of professional development	Partial Implementation Data submitted by project could not verify that 100% of K-3 teachers had participated in 20 hours of project sponsored professional development.

Figure 1. End-of-Project Objective/Activity Implementation Level		
Objective	Activity	Implementation
Provide students access to school libraries during nonschool hours.	Extend library availability by two hours a week for 32 weeks during the school year. Extend library availability during the summer academy by 12 hours per week for four weeks	Implemented
Improve students' reading skills.	Provide students with reading specialist and after-school tutoring Decrease the number of intensive or strategic readers in grades K-3 by 5%. Decrease the number of students below satisfactory in reading for grades 3-5 by 3%.	Implemented Tutors were made available to students twice a week. Partially Met Partially Met
The difference in rate of increase between participating schools and nonparticipating schools.	Compare library acquisition rates with like school.	Implemented The Shaping Literacy Project enabled Quapaw Elementary School Library a larger budget for acquisitions than the state library aid and funds raised by Fairview Elementary School.

Students in grades 2 - 5 showed an increase in reading skills and state reading benchmarks were met, which partially met targeted goals. However, poor record keeping on the part of project staff obscured the level and quality of implementation of project objectives. Of concern was the inability of the district to produce consistent circulation records. Also of concern was the omission to report the number of project sponsored professional development hours offered. The lack of project data provided to evaluators prohibits drawing any conclusions about the impact of the Shaping Literacy Project on the Quapaw elementary school library and Quapaw elementary students' reading achievement.

Quapaw Elementary School has taken steps to improve record keeping in their libraries. Each was implemented in fall 2009, shortly after the performance period for this project had ended. A new library inventory system was installed. This system will allow the elementary and secondary libraries to individualize inventories. Also, the Library Media Specialist has begun to order inventory CDs supplied by publishing companies with purchased resources. Each of these steps will help the Quapaw Elementary School Library operate in a more organized and efficient manner.

APPENDIX

Quapaw Elementary School
Spring 2009
Teacher Survey

Position: _____

Grade (s) Taught: _____

How many years have you taught/counseled/administrated at Quapaw: _____

In total, how many years have you taught/counseled/administrated: _____

Please provide short answers to the following questions.

1. List resources that you use in the Media Center?
2. What resources do take to from the Media Center to use in your classroom?
3. Do you use the library for student learning activities? If so, please describe these activities.
4. Did any of the professional development sessions you attended this year assist your use of Media Center resources? Please describe how.
5. Are there barriers to using the Media Center? If so please describe.
6. How can your Media Center be improved?