In 2015, the SBE adopted the current Oregon School Library Standards, with the request of the presentation committee to write grade level learning goals. The standards committee, comprised of members of Oregon Association of School Libraries (OASL), wrote grade level learning goals, resulting in revisions to the Oregon School Library Standards. This presentation is a review of the work completed to date, a history of the standards work, and a brief overview of the revised standards and new grade-level learning goals.

BACKGROUND

1. History:
   In 2010, a time when Oregon boasted 308 licensed librarians, an OASL ad hoc group of licensed librarians was tasked to write School Library Standards. The Oregon School Library Standards were written to guide and equalize teaching and learning in our libraries across Oregon.

   Up to that time, there was no definitive evidence that adopted standards for library instruction existed in Oregon. Individual school district guidelines for the operational management of a library space could be found, and in some districts local scope and sequence documents existed, but there were no guidelines that detailed how instruction was to take place or what teaching and learning should entail. From one district to another, even from one school to another in the same district, there was little consistency in expectations for student learning or for the types of resources to be provided.

   The committee was particularly concerned for communities, both rural and urban, where students were not getting access to a school library program -- especially where underserved students and families, and students with unique needs, were not being served. Often the committee heard from their higher education librarian colleagues that students were entering college lacking the skill sets necessary for basic entry level coursework.

   The OASL committee felt strongly that drafting standards and learning goals for library instruction were needed in order to define and build strong school library programs for all students.

   The teacher-librarians on the ad hoc committee came from both public and private libraries, represented all levels of K-12 instruction, and represented multiple regions in Oregon (Ashland, Bend-LaPine, Coos Bay, Neha-Kah-Nie, Portland). The rural areas in the eastern and southeastern counties in Oregon were not represented on the committee, as there were either very few or no teacher-librarians on staff in school districts in those counties.
The committee chair wrote and received a Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grant from the State Library of Oregon and used the funds to cover meeting expenses, allowing for concentrated time to research and develop standards during the 2011-12 school year. All members were working in school libraries, so the majority of work time was on weekends and over holidays.

Driving the work was the intent to provide equity of library instruction for all students, regardless of socio economic status and geographic location, or whether they attended public or private school. The committee was painfully aware that licensed librarian positions in Oregon were dwindling, even though scores of research studies across the country show the value of a licensed teacher librarian, and that a strong school library program yields greater student gains in achievement than does lowering class sizes.

The Oregon School Library Standards were presented to the State Board of Education (SBE) in late 2014, and the Standards were officially adopted by SBE in January 2015, with a unanimous consent. During the 2014 presentation to the SBE, it was suggested that the OASL Standards Committee write grade-level learning goals for each standard. Over the past four years, the committee has worked to draft the Grade Level Learning Goals, which are nearly complete, and which has resulted in the revision of the original library standards.

2. Purpose
   a. What function does this policy or update hold? This update serves to inform the current SBE of the work that has been accomplished in response to the request of the 2014 SBE. It also informs the current SBE of the revisions made to the original library standards during the development of the Grade Level Learning Goals. Though library standards are not called out in OAR 581-022-2030 for required revision, the OASL Standards Committee made revisions to the Oregon School Library Standards during the process of writing Grade Level Learning Goals.

3. Does the board have any areas of discretion on this policy and/or update?
The State Board of Education can vote to adopt the revised Oregon School Library Standards and the Grade Level Learning Goals. These standards support library media instruction for all grade levels, as called out in OAR 581-022-2340, Media Programs.

4. Stakeholder voice/input (individual and collective i.e., groups)
   a. Who was involved in bringing this to the Board? OASL Standards Committee
   b. What did engagement in this process entail? Feedback was solicited from library colleagues and education professionals:
      i. Nicole Dalton, Former ODE ELA Specialist
      ii. Marie Ballance, Ed.E., Former ODE ELA Specialist, Current Principal, Eagle Charter School, Salem, OR
      iii. Susan Tabor Boesch, Teacher-librarian, Hailey, ID
v. Rick Stoddart, Ed.D., Library Dean at Lane Community College, Eugene, OR
vi. Pam Kessinger, Portland Community College Librarian
vii. Sara Ralston, Eastern Oregon University Librarian
viii. Sally Mielke, Eastern Oregon University Librarian
ix. Other members of ACRL-Oregon (Association of College & Research Libraries)
x. Survey feedback from members of the following
   1. OASL
   2. OLA (Oregon Library Association)
   3. ILAGO (Information Literacy Advisory Group of Oregon)

c. Who may be affected by this? Students, licensed teacher librarians, classroom teachers, building administrators, district administrators, school board members, higher education instructional staff

d. Whose voice is missing potentially? Students and school staff in areas where no licensed teacher librarians exist to communicate the process and engage stakeholders. (Currently there are 189 FTE licensed teacher librarians in Oregon, which means that many students and staff in the approximately 1250 public schools in Oregon are not being served. Note that this number is down from 308 FTE in 2010, and 818 FTE in 1980.)

What more information does the Board need prior to moving forward? While the Oregon School Library Standards are considered academic content standards and listed on ODE’s academic content standards page, instruction to meet the standards is not required because library standards are not included in OAR 581-022-2030. Academic librarians believe that because the standards are adopted, students should be entering college with the related skills. However, many students still lack critical information literacy skills due to the reduced number of licensed teacher-librarians in K-12 schools, and the lack of access to strong school library programming.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (if applicable)

1. Has this been before the board before? If so, what action did the board take?
   A presentation of the school library standards was made to the State Board of Education on December 11, 2014. The Board moved to adopt the standards on January 22, 2015 and suggested that Grade Level Learning Goals be written to support implementation of the standards.

POLICY ISSUE OR CONCERNS
These policy issues or concerns could be from the field, stakeholder groups, statements submitted during the comment period, discussions among ODE staff or relevant stakeholders. Consider the following questions:

1. **Stakeholders**
   
a. How have you intentionally involved stakeholders who are also members of communities affected by this report or update?
   
   Feedback was solicited from library colleagues and education professionals:
   
   **Nicole Dalton, Former ODE ELA Specialist**
   
i. **Marie Ballance, Ed.E., Former ODE ELA Specialist, Current Principal, Eagle Charter School, Salem, OR**
   
   ii. **Susan Tabor Boesch, Teacher-librarian, Hailey, ID**
   
   iii. **Jennifer Maurer, School Library Consultant, State Library of Oregon**
   
   iv. **Rick Stoddart, Ed.D., Library Dean at Lane Community College, Eugene, OR**
   
   v. **Pam Kessinger, Portland Community College Librarian**
   
   vi. **Sara Ralston, Eastern Oregon University Librarian**
   
   vii. **Sally Mielke, Eastern Oregon University Librarian**
   
   viii. **Other members of ACRL-Oregon (Association of College & Research Libraries)**
   
   ix. **Survey feedback from members of the following**
   
   1. OASL
   
   2. OLA (Oregon Library Association)
   
   3. ILAGO (Information Literacy Advisory Group of Oregon)

b. Who are the historically underserved groups affected by this report or update?
   
   Students of color, students attending school in rural areas, students whose first language is other than English, students whose families are experiencing poverty


c. Does this update or report have tribal implications and it has been deemed appropriate by the Department’s Tribal Liaison, the Deputy Superintendent, or State Board?
   
   Feedback from the Department’s Tribal Liaison has been solicited, but has not yet been received. The Deputy Superintendent sits on the State Board and may provide feedback during and after this presentation.

d. How has the Oregon Department of Education modified or enhanced the report or update to address the needs of historically underserved communities?
   
   Feedback and support provided from the following people:
   
   - Nicole Dalton, former ODE ELA Specialist
   
   - Marie Ballance, Ed.E., former ODE ELA Specialist; current Principal, Eagle Charter School, Salem, OR
   
   - Joni Gillis, ODE
   
   - Terri Nelson, ODE
2. **Negative/Positive Effects**
   a. **What is the impact on the population most affected by this report or update that the board should consider?** The impact is that students will be better prepared to utilize information in life, college, and career, and licensed teacher-librarians will have a consistent way to teach these skills and work with classroom teachers to support implementation and instruction of their content standards. Additionally, district administrators will be better able to implement strong school library programs (in accordance with OAR 581-022-2340).

   b. **What is the impact on eliminating the opportunity or achievement gap?** The proposed revision to the standards clarifies the language of the standards, and the new Grade Level Learning Goals define a progression of skills and allows teacher-librarians to assess individual needs for instruction.

   c. **Have all the potential unintended consequences been considered?** Yes, unintended consequences have been considered.

   d. **Does this update or report advance the 40/40/20 goals?**
      Yes, the proposed revised standards articulate learning goals from Kindergarten through Grade 14. The committee includes an academic librarian who sought feedback from other academic librarians to help articulate the progression through Grade 14. The goal is to move students at the high school level who are taking college level and dual credit courses to the Grade 13-14 level.

      The library standards provide the foundation to foster success in college, supporting student achievement in earning a 2-year degree, and for students who continue to move beyond Grade 14 to receive a 4-year degree.

      According to a study by Topsy N. Smalley published in *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, May 2004*, “To be effective, experience with information literacy strategies needs to be part of the entire educational experience. School librarians and school library programs are key educational components. This study supports those assertions, as it demonstrates that students whose high schools include librarians and library instruction programs bring more understanding about information research to their college experiences.”

3. **What are the barriers to more equitable outcomes, either:**
   a. State or federally mandated? n/a
   b. Political? n/a
   c. Emotional? n/a
   d. Financial? n/a
e. Programmatic? A possible programmatic barrier is that school and district administrators may not yet have an understanding that library standards are considered part of Oregon’s required content standards, and are part of a strong school library program.

EQUITY IMPACT ANALYSIS (if applicable)

The following questions are designed to examine how this update or report systematically affect historically underserved students and/or communities.

1. Will historically underserved populations be impacted by this docket items? YES
   a. If yes, describe how this update or report could produce other unintended consequences not listed in the docket. Historically underserved populations will be positively impacted by these proposed library standards/learning goal revisions as there is greater coherence and alignment between and among grade levels, creating more explicit opportunity for teacher-librarians to meet students where they are and help them to continue to grow.

   School and district administrators serving underserved communities can use the Oregon School Library Standards and articulated Grade Level Learning Goals to develop and implement a strong school library program specific to their community.

2. Examine the potential impact of this update or report on historically underserved populations in Oregon. Describe this ongoing and/or foreseeable impact, using as much detail as possible.
   One of the strongest indicators of a strong school library program is instruction based on standards, especially in collaboration with content area teachers. The Oregon School Library Standards will provide a framework for instruction, that when applied in collaboration between a licensed teacher-librarian and a content-specific classroom teacher, will scaffold learning for all students, including historically underserved populations. The standards will serve as a measure for evaluation of students’ learning to ensure their success in mastering the standards.

   Impact studies have consistently shown positive correlations between high-quality library programs and student achievement. Data from more than 34 statewide studies [including Oregon] suggest that students tend to earn better standardized test scores in schools that have strong library programs. (Gretes, 2013; Scholastic, 2016).

   According to an article in the Phi Delta Kappan (March 26, 2018), by Keith Curry Lance and Debra E Kachel, “Skeptics might assume that these benefits [high-quality library program and student achievement] are associated mainly with wealthier schools, where well-resourced libraries serve affluent students. However, researchers have been careful to control for school and community socioeconomic factors, and they have found that these correlations cannot be
explained away by student demographics, school funding levels, teacher-pupil ratios, or teacher qualifications. In fact, they have often found that the benefits associated with good library programs are strongest for the most vulnerable and at-risk learners, including students of color, low-income students, and students with disabilities."

3. Explain how this update or report works toward the elimination of either (one or both):
   a. the achievement gap
   An article by Patricia McGuire, The Chronicle of Higher Education: April 12, 2018: Want More College Students to Graduate? Fix the High Schools - by Patricia McGuire (Patricia McGuire is President of Washington Trinity University) provides the following: According to Antwan Wilson, Chancellor of the Washington D.C. public schools, “Too many public high schools are failing, especially those serving low-income students of color. McGuire writes, “[College] students are set up for failure from the start. Add to academic deficiencies the intractable hurdles of poverty, like being hungry and sometimes homeless, and by midterm in the first year, too many freshmen are already failing. Colleges devote substantial resources to remediation and support services just to get students across the first-semester finish line. But over time, many underprepared and impoverished students simply stop attending, stop answering the persistent phone calls and texts from advisers, and disappear into the diaspora of the more than 30 million Americans who have attended college but have no degree.”

   Strong library programs and teacher-librarians who teach to the Oregon School Library Standards using the Grade Level Learning Goals will benefit students who currently fall into the category of “underserved” populations.

   b. the opportunity gap
   Students who receive instruction of the library standards will be better prepared to transition to college and potentially more successful in continuing their college career. 2013-2016 Institutional Research data presented by a team of Academic Librarians from the Pierce Library at Eastern Oregon University, shows that for all incoming freshman students, those from rural populations are the most impacted by a lack of prior Information Literacy instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total 1st YR Students</th>
<th>Total Unprepared</th>
<th>Students from Rural Areas</th>
<th># Surveyed</th>
<th>% Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISCAL ANALYSIS (if applicable)

Are there any fiscal impacts that the Board should consider as part of this update or report?
No fiscal impacts are anticipated.

Does the proposed rule change impact other stakeholders?
This is not a proposed rule change.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1:

List of letters of Support

Letters of Support