

which does not exist in many school districts which do not have even one trained school librarian. Lack of sufficient administrative staff is also a serious handicap in many large city school systems. Attention should be given to the needs of localities as well as the States. In other school districts the library facilities were inadequate. However, the great bulk of the reports indicate that the problems were minor compared to the great benefits received under the Act.

The State and local supervisors report that implementation of Title II, overall, presented no major problems except in the large metropolitan areas. Selection and purchasing were usually delegated by the States to local public school systems. Delivery on orders were usually reasonably rapid. The schools used a wide variety of recognized selection aids in choosing materials. (The American Association of School Librarians prepared and published a pamphlet, *Selecting Materials for School Libraries; Guidelines for Quality Collections*, in an edition of 175,000 copies for free distribution through the State departments of education, which was used in many schools.) The teachers and librarians selected materials to meet school needs in supporting the instructional program, emphasizing, in many places, materials for slow learners, for advanced students, and for other children with special needs, especially the disadvantaged.

Not even personnel shortages seriously hampered schools in implementing Title II. Eligible schools were able to employ librarians and library clerks with Title I ESEA funds, using the two titles to support each other. In other school systems local funds supplied additional personnel and facilities, a good example of how a federal aid program can encourage greater local effort. Often the schools coordinated Title II and NDEA Title III, purchasing audiovisual materials of instruction with Title II funds, and the necessary audiovisual equipment under NDEA Title III.

Specific examples of improved instructional materials acquired and library programs resulting from Title II furnish more dramatic evidence of the value of this important education legislation. For example, Jefferson County School District, in Colorado, developed an Art and Music Reference Library so that all county teachers would have access to materials which could not be duplicated economically in every school.

In Oklahoma, the Putnam City Schools developed new central libraries in all of its eleven schools by consolidating small existing classroom collections and adding new materials with Title II funds. With local money, the district employed a school library supervisor, and organized the materials so that even those they had before Title II were made more accessible to support the learning needs of boys and girls.

The Chanute, Kansas, Board of Education, hired a library coordinator, one and one-half librarians, and eight part-time library clerks in order to assure effective use of Title II materials in its eight elementary schools. Chanute organized central processing for its school library resources, and developed a union catalog so that all pupils could benefit from the collections.

The Nebraska State Department of Education developed a unique school library demonstration program. Using part of its Title II administrative allocation, Nebraska purchased a mobile unit and stocked it with examples of quality print and non-print instructional materials, equipment for using non-print materials, and library supplies and equipment. They have used their mobile model library throughout the State for in-service education and to encourage local effort in developing school library services.

These reports are representative of the exciting developments in school library services, and are a few examples of what is occurring throughout the Nation under ESEA, but it is still too early for a definitive report on the effects of Title II. However, it is a highly visible program, and one that shows an immediate effect on teaching and learning. In most States, it has had its greatest impact on elementary schools, where the need for school library resources was greatest, with a much smaller portion of the funds under Title II going to secondary schools. It has provided both books and audiovisual materials in order to support instruction with the widest possible range of learning materials. The second year of implementation of this title will, undoubtedly, show even more benefit in improved education.

On behalf of the American Library Association, and especially of the 11,340 members of the American Association of School Librarians, I wish to thank this Committee and the Congress for its farsightedness in enacting such beneficial legislation, and to urge its extension at this time for another five years with increased authorizations to assure a continuing effort to achieve quality education for the boys and girls of the United States through expanded school library resources.