

Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

---

Teaching & Learning Faculty Publications

Teaching & Learning

---

7-2015

## A Tale of Two Surveys: A Comparison of National Studies on School District Library Supervisors

Diane Barlow

Jeffrey DiScala

Ann Carlson Weeks

Christie Kodama

Kelsey Jarrell

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/teachinglearning\\_fac\\_pubs](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/teachinglearning_fac_pubs)



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

---

**Authors**

Diane Barlow, Jeffrey DiScala, Ann Carlson Weeks, Christie Kodama, Kelsey Jarrell, Leah Jacobs, and Sheri A. Massey

---

---

# A Tale of Two Surveys: A Comparison of National Studies on School District Library Supervisors

**Diane Barlow**

**Jeffrey DiScala**

**Ann Carlson Weeks**

**Christie Kodama**

**Kelsey Jarrell**

**Leah Jacobs**

**Sheri A. Massey**

**College of Information Studies**

**University of Maryland, USA**

---

*In the last 50 years, the only national surveys of supervisors of school library services at the district level in the United States were conducted by research teams separated by decades in the College of Information Studies, University of Maryland. In this paper, the background, purpose and goals, methodologies, and findings of the two surveys are compared. The comparison reveals similarities and differences in the profile of the district supervisor, roles and responsibilities of the position, and incumbents' attitudes toward and experience with change.*

## Introduction

Perhaps it is simply a coincidence that the only two national surveys of that focused on district-level supervisors of school library services were conducted by research teams at the University of Maryland's College of Information Studies. The first survey, entitled "The School Library Supervisor and Her Situation," was part of a large-scale, multiyear research project called *A Program of Research into the Identification of Manpower Requirements, the Educational Preparation and the Utilization of Manpower in the Library and Information Professions*, which was funded by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW), and conducted from 1967-1970. The survey discussed in this paper is one of four parallel surveys, which looked at administrators in public, academic, and special libraries and school librarians working at the district level. Commonly referred to as the "Manpower Project," it should not be confused with the School Library Manpower Project, which was conducted during approximately the same time period and funded by the Knapp Foundation. The Task Analysis survey, which was a part of the Knapp Manpower Project, focused primarily on building level personnel and because of its different focus is not included in this discussion. The second survey to be discussed in this paper was conducted

---

Copyright of works published in School Libraries Worldwide is jointly held by the author(s) and by the International Association of School Librarianship. The author(s) retain copyright of their works, but give permission to the International Association of School Librarianship to reprint their works in collections or other such documents published by or on behalf of the International Association of School Librarianship. Author(s) who give permission for their works to be reprinted elsewhere should inform the Editor of School Libraries Worldwide and should ensure that the following appears with the article: Reprinted, with permission, from School Libraries Worldwide, Volume 21, Number 2, July 2015 pages 73-84, doi: 10.14265.21.2.006

as part of the Lilead Project, which began in 2012 to collect and analyze information about school library personnel at the district level and continues today (The Lilead Project, 2015). The juxtaposition of these two surveys, which both focused on the roles and responsibilities of school library personnel at the district level, invites a comparison between the studies to identify indications of stability and change in school library administration at the district level and differences in survey methodology between the two eras.

It is important to state that the Lilead survey, conducted in 2012 and repeated in 2014, was not a follow-up or replication of the 1968-1969 DHEW Manpower survey. Each project – the DHEW Manpower Project and its survey and the Lilead Project and its survey – stands on its own. While Lilead research team members were familiar with the Knapp Manpower survey and the DHEW Manpower survey, the purpose, conceptualization, and design of the Lilead survey differed significantly from the surveys conducted more than four decades earlier. A side-by-side analysis of the studies of district supervisors can illuminate the status of supervisors in two different eras, assumptions about their demographics, roles, problems faced, and resources available for their use. We will compare the DHEW Manpower survey and Lilead survey on these points: background and goals; methodology; and key findings.

Before beginning the comparison, we acknowledge that surveys to collect data about building-level school librarians, such as the Knapp Project's School Library Personnel Task Analysis Survey mentioned above, the Schools and Staffing Surveys (SASS) and the annual Common Core of Data (CCD) conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), and School Libraries Count! conducted by the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), have been taking place for many years; however, these projects, valuable as they are, focus on building-level programs and collect virtually no data on district-level services, staffing, or support. Their findings add immeasurably to the knowledge base of the field, but differ in essential ways from the two studies analyzed here, which are studies of school library services at the district level, not the building level.

## **Background, Purpose, and Goals**

### ***DHEW Manpower Project***

The DHEW Manpower Project was conducted by Mary Lee Bundy and Paul Wasserman at the School of Library and Information Services (now the College of Information Studies), University of Maryland, from 1967-1970. Funding was provided by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the National Science Foundation; and the National Library of Medicine. Until the Lilead survey in 2012, the survey of district supervisors of school library services that was part of the DHEW Manpower Project was the only national study that specifically focused on the role of the library media supervisor in large districts. The DHEW Manpower Project grew out of a conference at the University of Maryland in 1966, in which librarians, information specialists, and social scientists gathered to consider workforce requirements for academic, public, school, and special libraries. The conference was held at a time of wide-spread self-examination by librarians and information professionals seeking answers to questions about the nature of the profession, distinctions between professional and nonprofessional work, and current and future needs for information workers at all levels (Brown, 1969).

The landmark DHEW Manpower Project was actually a group of related studies conducted by a multidisciplinary research team from several universities. Wasserman directed the project with Bundy as co-director. The purpose of the three-year project was to provide information on

---

manpower requirements of librarianship and other information professions that would be useful in addressing questions related to the selection, recruitment, training, and utilization of personnel. Discrete parts of the overall project were directed by a diverse group of prominent scholars from psychology, sociology, economics, business, administration, and librarianship. The research team included, in addition to Wasserman and Bundy, Robert Presthus, Political Science Department, York University; Stanley J. Segal, Counseling and Student Development, Hunter College, City University of New York; J. Hart Walters, Jr., School of Business Administration, Temple University; and Rodney White, Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University (Wasserman & Bundy, 1969).

The project's Advisory Board included prominent figures such as Lester Asheim, Director, Office of Library Education, American Library Association; Jesse H. Shera, Dean, School of Library Science, Case Western Reserve University; William T. Knox, Vice President, McGraw-Hill, Inc.; Sidney R. Galler, Assistant Secretary for Science, Smithsonian Institution; Herbert S. White, Leasco Systems and Research Corporation; and others (Wasserman & Bundy, 1969). The affiliation of these individuals indicates the high level of attention and support that Wasserman and Bundy were able to garner for their work.

### ***Lilead Project***

In 2010, forty years after completion of the DHEW Manpower Project, school libraries in the United States were facing numerous challenges, with some library programs eliminated and many survivors enduring cuts in budget and staff. Individuals with little or no specialized library training were replacing state-certified librarians. Classroom collections of paperback books replaced some centralized libraries. There were many instances in which access to the library by teachers and students was often limited, placing new restrictions on students with few options for access beyond the school. While librarians were constantly working as advocates for their programs, researchers at the University of Maryland thought one individual, the district library supervisor, might be in a prime position to help with the efforts of school library programs, but little was known about their current work. After reflecting on the 40-year-old data from the DHEW Manpower Project, this group of researchers sought funding to conduct a new study about the roles and responsibilities of school district library supervisors and their contributions to school library programs.

The Lilead Project, a national workforce study of district-level supervisors, was funded in 2011 by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). Its overarching goal is to study, support, and build community among supervisors. The Lilead Project team conducts work in three areas:

- the Lilead Survey, a national survey of district library supervisors in large school districts;
- the Lilead Network, an online community that brings supervisors together in an environment that will support and inform the study; and
- the Lilead Fellows Program, an extended, intensive professional development program for a small group of selected library supervisors that began in July 2014.

The purpose of the Lilead survey was to collect and analyze data that would begin to create a clearer, more current picture of the demographic characteristics of district supervisors, their roles and responsibilities, and the most critical issues they face. The Lilead findings also provide baseline data regarding trends in school library program development for ongoing study and research.

The Lilead Project and survey were designed and conducted by a research team with significant interest and experience in and knowledge of school library services, in contrast to the team for the DHEW Manpower Project. Dr. Ann Weeks, Associate Dean for Academic Programs of the iSchool is Principle Investigator. Weeks is a recognized leader with extensive experience in education for and the practice of school librarianship at the building and district levels. Her previous experience building and district level school library positions, Executive Director of the American Association of School Librarians, and director of the school library specialization in the Master of Library Science degree program at the iSchool. Jeffrey DiScala, co-Principle Investigator, is a doctoral student pursuing a specialization in administration of school library programs. Other members of the research team have education and experience in school librarianship, as well.

## Research Design

The design and distribution of the two surveys varied in multiple and significant ways. What follows is a detailed description of the information gathered from the DHEW Manpower Project's survey compared with the Lilead Project's survey. Each section discusses the assumptions the surveys were grounded in, whom the surveys were sent to, and the content of the surveys.

### ***DHEW Manpower Project***

Two key assumptions can be discerned from reports from the DHEW Manpower Project. The first assumption was that relationships between human and organizational variables and organizational attitudes and behaviors were indicators of capacity for organizational and professional change. To study these relationships, Wasserman and Bundy collected and analyzed data on the background, attitudes, and behaviors of library administrators and characteristics of the libraries themselves. The second key assumption was that the capacity for change and innovation in librarianship as a profession and in libraries as a whole was equitable across four types of library environments – academic, public, school, and special libraries. These assumptions were the basis for the DHEW Manpower Project's study of district supervisors of school libraries.

The DHEW Manpower survey was distributed to chief administrators of large public, academic, school, and special libraries. The same questionnaire template was used for each type of library, modified as required by differences among organizational forms and principle issues involving change. The school supervisor study included districts that had an enrollment of at least 25,000 students and a designated library supervisor position. In addition to the public school districts included in this survey, six large private school systems that met the qualifications were also included in the survey.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections. Each section is described below with representative questions from the section.

**Section 1: Background and Career.** This section asked for extensive personal and family information. In addition to standard questions about gender and age, questions addressed the respondent's marital status, number of children, husband's occupation and employment status, places of birth and secondary education, parents' education, and father's occupation. It seems it was assumed that the supervisor was a female and, if married, was married to a male. No questions were asked about race or ethnicity.

The respondent's post-secondary education was probed with questions about graduation year and undergraduate major; the nature, extent, and location of formal education in library science and year of graduation; and other graduate education. Other questions addressed work

---

history in librarianship and other fields; factors for and timing of the decision to enter librarianship and to take a supervisory position; attitudes toward their career; future career plans; professional activities outside the school system; and professional development.

**Section 2: Professional and Administrative Issues.** This section began by asking the respondent to complete a Likert-type scale of agreement with statements about professional and administrative issues such as:

- Despite other factors, advancement in most libraries still depends largely on ability.
- Librarians in general are far too timid and passive.
- There is probably not much the average library administrator can do to effect change much, one way or the other.

There is potential confusion in the statements in this section because some refer specifically to school libraries and librarians, while others refer to libraries and librarians in other settings. Directions for this section do not state an expectation either way. Some questions appear to be customized for school library concerns with references to certification, teacher backgrounds, competition with public libraries, and school principals. Other questions, such as one about reference librarians, seem less relevant to the school setting.

These questions were followed by open-ended questions that asked for a short response to statements about the impact of technology on libraries, library education, the American Library Association (ALA), unionization of librarians, new standards for school libraries, the need to attract new types of individuals into librarianship, the impact of school principals on school libraries, the success of school libraries, and the future of library networks. This section closed by asking the respondent's opinion about attitudes and behaviors necessary to effect change in school library situations.

**Section 3: Library Change Report.** This section asked respondents to describe changes in financial resources, collection development, technology, processes and procedures, facilities, user services, personnel, salaries, and organization and administration that were in progress or made since 1965, and to identify the single most important of these recent changes. Additional questions asked the respondent's satisfaction with the rate of change in the system, desired short-term and long-term changes and the likelihood of realizing the desired changes.

**Section 4: Institutional Data.** This section asked questions about the school system – student enrollment, personnel, budget, and special services offered; the status of librarians; and the involvement of the respondent with the school system as a whole. The remainder of the section addressed automation, interlibrary cooperation, evaluation, planning, conflict, organization, and external pressure.

The questionnaire included 173 questions, many of which required short, open-ended responses. Completing the instrument would have required considerable time and thought. The response rate of 66 percent seems very good considering the time commitment required to provide answers.

### ***Lilead Survey***

The primary assumption upon which the Lilead survey was built is that the district supervisor is integral to advocacy and support for the district school library program and that an understanding of the situation of the supervisor can be built best from information supplied by the supervisors themselves. The Lilead survey was not intended as a step in creating broad statements about the entire profession of librarianship or about libraries as a whole.

The population for the survey included supervisors in all school districts with student populations of at least 25,000, the same as that of the DHEW Manpower Project. In the ten states (including the District of Columbia) that did not have a school district with at least 25,000 students, the largest school district in the state was selected for a total survey population of 290 school districts. The number of school districts meeting this population criterion increased from 150 school districts in 1968 to 280 in 2012. The decision to include at least one school district from every state and the District of Columbia in the survey population was made in order to gather nationwide baseline data.

By the time the survey was ready to launch, the research team eliminated 17 districts from the survey population. Reasons for elimination included districts lacking a library supervisor position, an inability to find contact information for the supervisor, and participants' inability to get research participation approval from their school districts. The survey was deployed electronically to 273 individuals on October 10, 2012. Of the 273 supervisors who received the survey, 166 completed the questionnaire for a response rate of 61 percent. Respondents represented school districts in 38 states.

In contrast to the questionnaire used in the DHEW Manpower survey, the Lilead survey was designed specifically for library supervisors of school districts, not library supervisors of all types of libraries. The researchers who constructed the draft questionnaire have direct experience with the school library profession, either as building-level school librarians or district supervisors. Additional input from an advisory board of experts in the school library field helped finalize the survey instrument.

The web-based questionnaire included 58 questions, many with multiple close-ended responses, and was designed to elicit information to create a national profile of district library supervisors—demographics of the position incumbents, knowledge and skills required for the position, and most significant issues facing the library programs and services in the respective districts. The survey instrument was divided into five sections.

**Section 1. Your Office and Your School District.** This section asked for information about the title of the supervisor's position and its location in the system's organizational structure, the size and composition of the district library staff, and whether the supervisor's district responsibilities were full-time.

**Section 2. Your Tasks and Responsibilities.** This section contained a series of questions that asked the supervisor to rate the importance of up to seven tasks within each of these areas: finance, personnel, collection development, teaching and learning, leadership, professional organizations, technology, and facilities. This section also contained a question about the nature of the supervisor's role (primary responsibility, advisory responsibility, or not a responsibility) for seven tasks or decisions related to personnel, selection and evaluation, professional development, and technology support.

**Section 3. How You Spend Your Time.** This section asked about the frequency with which the supervisor engaged in tasks in the areas of finance, personnel, collection development, technology, teaching, leadership, and professional development. A question about areas of need for professional development was also included in this section.

**Section 4. Changes in Your Program.** This section asked the respondent about changes from the previous school year in funding, personnel, standards and curriculum, policy, and other issues relevant to the supervisor's position.

**Section 5. Your Personal Information.** This section asked questions about the respondent's age, gender, race/ethnicity, length of time in the district and in the supervisor

---



position, educational background, previous professional positions, and certifications and qualifications held. The final two questions asked about the salary schedule for the supervisor position and whether it was part of a collective bargaining unit.

## Key Findings

Comparing findings from the two national surveys of district supervisors is difficult for two reasons. First, overlap between the two sets of questions is limited because the goals of the two projects differed. The DHEW Manpower survey collected data about the supervisor's family background and early education, decisions to enter and remain in a library career, opinions about librarianship and school librarianship, particularly about topics related to change; number of school libraries and faculty in the district; special units, such as learning resource centers; budgets for school libraries and for the system; community relations; and other topics that were not part of the Lilead survey. The Lilead survey collected extensive data about the roles and responsibilities of the supervisor position, the nature and perceived importance of these tasks, and the frequency of the supervisor's performance of the tasks; the district-level office for library services; and perceived needs for professional development, all of which were either a limited part of the DHEW Manpower survey, or not included at all.

Another source of difficulty in comparing the two sets of results is that we must work from published findings from the DHEW Manpower Project, rather than from the collected data of the survey itself; the data that the DHEW Manpower Project researchers chose to report and the ways in which it was reported are static and additional analysis cannot be performed.

Within these limitations, we will compare the results of the surveys through construction of a demographic profile of the district supervisor, a comparison of the roles and responsibilities of the supervisor position, and their experience with and attitudes toward change.

### **Demographic Profile**

Correspondence between demographic and background characteristics of supervisors in the two studies is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Comparison of the Demographic Profile of Supervisors**

Characteristic	DHEW Manpower Survey	Lilead Survey
Gender	80% female	80% female
Race/Ethnicity	Not included	87% white
Age	53% over 50 years old	49% 55-64 years old
Graduate degree in library science	50%	61%
Classroom teaching experience	54% are former high school teachers; data for other levels is not available	72% are former classroom teachers; all levels
Time in supervisor's position	57% five years or less Range: less than 1 year to more than 26 years	46% five years or less Range: less than 1 year to more than 16 years

The demographic profiles of district supervisors are similar. The largest change is in the length of tenure as a supervisor: current supervisors appear to have more years of experience in the position than supervisors from the earlier survey did.

**Major Roles and Responsibilities**

In the DHEW Manpower survey, respondents were asked to list their roles and responsibilities. The Lilead questionnaire asked respondents to rate the importance of 46 tasks. Table 2 shows roles and responsibilities that were described in the DHEW Manpower report as being of “major importance” or “heavy commitment,” or were reported in a way that implies significance (Bundy, Wasserman, & O’Connell, 1970, p. 17), and those from the Lilead survey that are in the top 25 percent of all items in ratings of importance. (Items from the Lilead survey are listed in descending order of importance.)

**Table 2. Comparison of the Major Roles and Responsibilities of Supervisors**

DHEW Manpower Survey	Lilead Survey
Train teachers in the use of library materials	Offering professional development for building-level librarians
Secure resources for accelerated library involvement	Advocating for library programs
Secure approval for accelerated library involvement	Meeting with building-level librarians
Active interchange with teachers	Advising building-level librarians
Active interchange with system administrators	Developing a vision and mission for the library program
Implementation of the multimedia concept in place of the traditional school library	Handling book challenges and censorship issues
Recruitment, training, and retraining of staff	Developing library policies
	Developing library procedures
	Meeting with other district-level administrators
	Participating in state professional organizations
	Budgeting (district-level)
	Integrating local and state content standards into the curriculum

Even without perfect correspondence between the roles and responsibilities from the two surveys, it is easy to see similarities and differences:

- Educating and supporting building-level staff, advocating for library programs, and engaging with other system administrators were major roles for supervisors in both eras. Lilead data show that at least half of the supervisors perform tasks for each of these roles either daily or weekly.

- Supervisors in the 1960s seemed to have interacted with teachers, a responsibility that did not emerge in the Lilead study.
- Long-range planning and collection development are important tasks for supervisors today, but were mentioned by only a few respondents to the DHEW Manpower survey.
- Respondents in the Lilead survey gave high importance to participation in state professional associations; although 76 percent of respondents to the DHEW Manpower survey reported that they belonged to a professional association, they did not include participation as an important part of their professional responsibilities.
- Supervisors in the Lilead survey rated leadership tasks, handling book challenges, and curriculum work as important responsibilities. These tasks were not mentioned in reports from the DHEW Manpower survey.

### **Technology**

The DHEW Manpower survey was conducted on the cusp of an information revolution. District supervisors were immersed in integrating audio-visual materials in school collections and training library staff and teachers on their effective use. Their ideas about the potential of automated library systems and computer-based information resources were divided. Thirty-five percent of respondents agreed with the statement, "The computer offers some but no major advantages for school libraries" (Bundy et al., 1970, pp. 35–36). Because of the awkward wording of the statement, it is impossible to interpret the opinions of the 49 percent who disagreed; they may have seen no advantage or great advantage to libraries.

Data from the survey indicate the extent of automated systems in school districts in 1969:

- Computer technology had been introduced recently in the libraries in the districts of 37 percent of respondents
- 47 percent of supervisors reported planning for automation for ordering and other operations
- 59 percent of supervisors reported using computers to prepare special bibliographies
- 41 percent of supervisors reported using computers to prepare a book catalog
- 23 percent of supervisors reported using computers for ordering
- Other reported uses of computers were for circulation, serials, business operations, cataloging, analyzing use, collection development, inventory control, and record keeping
- Responses to a question about external demands on the system or individual libraries included improvements that would have been dependent on computer technology: increase in speed of processing materials, specialized services such as literature searches, and improved interlibrary loan (pp. 89-90)
- Application of computer technology to library operations was one of the three major recent changes identified by supervisors, who cited higher efficiency and quality as results of this change (p. 58)

More respondents agreed than disagreed that ultimately information retrieval systems would be used in the libraries. The use of computers to replace card catalogs and to provide information retrieval was mentioned, as were computer-aided operations such as purchasing. Other respondents felt that the impact of computer technology would be limited, with cost cited as a barrier that would be difficult to overcome.

By the time of the Lilead survey, the questions concerning technology had changed from questions about the future to questions about supervisor's responsibilities. According to data from the Lilead survey, the most important technology tasks for supervisors were:

- 62 percent of supervisors indicated that managing library automation systems was extremely important and reported that it was a daily task.
- 54 percent of supervisors said managing database subscriptions was extremely important.
  
- 39 percent of supervisors stated that providing technology support to building-level library staff was extremely important and, for most, was a daily or weekly task.
- 37 percent of supervisors responded that providing technology training for building-level personnel was extremely important and, for most, was a monthly task.

Smaller numbers of supervisors responding to the Lilead survey developed technology plans and policies and purchased hardware and software, as well.

It is difficult to compare the findings from the two surveys related to the engagement of supervisors with technology. The DHEW Manpower research team was critical of supervisors for their failure to grasp the potential of the computer for revolutionizing information services and institutions and described the supervisors as seeking to be absolved of responsibilities for bringing about technological change (pp.28-29). However, the same data can be interpreted in an entirely different way that suggests that overwhelming changes in school libraries had begun and that these changes prophesied the critical roles in technology leadership that the supervisors would report in the Lilead survey forty years in the future.

### ***District Office***

A significant finding related to the district office from the DHEW Manpower survey was that the position of district supervisor of library services was relatively new, and that neither titles nor roles of the new position seemed standardized. Examples of titles include supervisor of school libraries, coordinator of instruction, and director of library services (pp. 46-47). Decades later the Lilead survey found the same lack of standardization among titles for the position, with numerous variations (i.e., coordinator, director, supervisor, and chair).

Supervisors in the DHEW Manpower survey most frequently named the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction as their direct supervisor (32 percent) (p. 55). Supervisors in the Lilead survey reported a similar situation, naming the "Director" (37 percent) as their direct supervisor and their overarching department as Curriculum and Instruction (48 percent). Both surveys revealed variations in the department within which the district library services office was located.

### ***Change***

Because a major goal of the DHEW Manpower survey was to assess capacity for change in school libraries and librarians, there is much more information about change to be learned from it than from the Lilead survey. Bundy and Wasserman were highly critical of school district supervisors as change agents. Using levels of dissatisfaction, staff conflict, and participation in unions as positive indicators of potential for change, Bundy and Wasserman interpreted the low levels of each of these factors reported by supervisors as proof that school library supervisors were more entrenched in the status quo than were administrators in other types of libraries (pp. 51-52).

However, data from the DHEW Manpower survey lead to a different conclusion. The below examples suggest that school library supervisors may have had a higher capacity for change than interpreted in the original reported results. Among these are data that show that among supervisors (pp. 80-83):

---

- 92 percent did not agree with the statement that the average library administrator could do little to effect change.
- 67 percent agreed with the statement that other agencies would replace school libraries if the libraries did not change.
- 57 percent agreed that librarians had not stood up to censorship as much as they should.
- 59 percent agreed that librarians in general were too timid and passive.
- A large number agreed that the school library failed to meet the needs of the school community.

Supervisors in the DHEW Manpower survey were asked to identify the most important recent change affecting their responsibilities. Three changes were cited:

- Wide acceptance of the instructional resource center concept with its emphasis on multimedia resources
- Increased funding for materials, equipment, and staff (primarily from federal sources)
- Application of computer technology to library operations

Each of these three changes brought about fundamental shifts in the concept of a school library, the resources and services it was expected to provide, and the required competencies and skills of its staff. The timing of the DHEW Manpower survey allowed it to capture a snapshot of the supervisor and school libraries on the cusp of profound change.

The Lilead survey was interested in a different aspect of change by asking supervisors to describe changes from the previous year in program emphasis, demands on their time, policies, and resources. The respondents reported:

- There were significant changes in emphasis within the district:
  - the emphasis on classroom content standards increased
  - the emphasis on helping students become information-literate increased
- Supervisors spent the same or an increased amount of time on these responsibilities:
  - training, or advising on training, building-level librarians
  - evaluating, or advising on evaluating, building-level librarians
  - consulting with principals
  - communicating the library program's contribution to student achievement
- In most districts:
  - funding for district-level and building-level library programs and services stayed the same or decreased.
  - funding for technology stayed the same or decreased.
  - staffing for district-level and building-level library programs and services stayed the same or decreased.
  - the availability of qualified candidates for library jobs stayed the same or decreased.
- District policies on use of social media and mobile devices became less restrictive or remained the same.

This brief profile of changes happening in school districts at the time of each survey is a study in contrasts. The DHEW Manpower survey took place at a time when resources were plentiful; 83 percent reported an extraordinary increase in the money available to purchase materials. There were substantial staff increases (57 percent), new types of positions were being added (65 percent), and salaries were increasing (50 percent). Library collections were expanding in size and kinds of materials offered. Additionally, facilities were being renovated or new facilities were being added. In contrast, the Lilead survey documented a time when resources were stable at best and decreasing for many, while demands on the supervisor's time grew.

## Conclusion

This side-by-side examination of the only two national surveys of district supervisors of school library services has shown how much some things have stayed the same and how much others have changed. Even though the DHEW Manpower Project and the Lilead Project differ considerably, the findings from their surveys can be compared and yield interesting results.

Through the comparison, we know that the profile of the supervisor and many of the major roles and responsibilities in the two eras correspond closely. On the other hand, we found differences between the eras in engagement with technology, some aspects of the district office, and recent and ongoing changes that affect the supervisor and library services. Some of the changes that we found could be based on the differences in the availability and use of computer technology. The DHEW Manpower Project gives us a valuable picture of the supervisor and school library operations just as the information technology revolution was beginning to gather momentum.

We have interpreted findings and data from the DHEW Manpower Project in ways that differ slightly from those of Wasserman and Bundy, the original researchers. Our interpretations may differ from theirs, but we are indebted to them for conducting a study that has stood the test of time and remains valuable today.

## References

- Brown, H. J. (1969). Personnel and Manpower Needs of the Future. *Library Trends*, 18, 75–84.
- Bundy, M. L., Wasserman, P., & O'Connell, J. (1970). *The School Library Supervisor and Her Situation: Final Report*. College Park, MD.
- The Lilead Project. (2015). Lilead Project Website. Retrieved from <http://lileadproject.org/>
- Wasserman, P., & Bundy, M. L. (1969). *A Program of Research into the Identification of Manpower Requirements, the Educational Preparation and the Utilization of Manpower in the Library and Information Profession. Final Report, Phase I*. doi:ED 023 938.

## Lead Author Note

**Dr. Diane Barlow** is Assistant to the Dean of the College of Information Studies, University of Maryland, College Park, MD. She teaches in the areas of user needs and libraries as social institutions. She has extensive research experience in studies of user satisfaction with library and information services, adoption of new technologies, administration of library networks, professional roles and responsibilities in various types of libraries, student experience and satisfaction with educational programs, student career expectations, and related topics. She can be contacted at: [dbarlow@umd.edu](mailto:dbarlow@umd.edu).

All other authors are members of the Lilead Project Team at the University of Maryland's College of Information Studies.

---