

offered no direct aid to the school library, the expertise in lobbying developed during these years by the ALA and its allies, particularly the publishers, was to be useful in legislative hearings on federal aid to education.

The years following World War II burdened education with demands for which it was unprepared. The baby boom with swollen school attendance, the knowledge and technology explosion with growing public concern about the school's ability to cope, the immigration of rural Americans—particularly poor and black Americans—to the cities and the shift of middle-class whites to the suburbs, and the worsening economic plight of the parochial schools plagued the nation's school systems. Washington responded haltingly to the need for massive support of the public schools, stumbling according to two contemporary scholars "on the three 'R's' of Race, Religion and Reds (Federal Control)."⁴ The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, spurred by Sputnik, supported substantial programs in mathematics, science and foreign language, but largely ignored rural and urban schools. During the Kennedy administration, education bills were introduced in 1961 and 1963, but foundered on the church/state controversy over aid to parochial schools.

In 1965, ESEA packaged five separate titles of categorical grants which offered something to every interest group while denying its full range of demands.⁵ Title I, in its first year accounting for five-sixths of the total funds authorized through ESEA, subsidized local educational agencies for the education of children from low-income families. Title II provided grants for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for use by children in private or church-related as well as public schools. Title III authorized supplementary educational centers and services to stimulate exemplary and innovative programs. Title IV aimed to improve educational research and its dissemination, while Title V was to strengthen the state educational agencies. Although both Titles I and III required local schools to include in their projects services for children in private, nonprofit schools, Title II is credited with embodying the major effort of federal policy makers to placate the parochial school interests and their supporters in Congress.⁶

ESEA was a dramatic breakthrough in federal assistance to the nation's schools. School libraries, singled out for direct benefit in Title II, also stood to gain indirectly from Titles I, III, and V. Since political expediency dictated the library's recognition in Title II, what would

ESEA Title II

happen in later years when such strategy was unnecessary?

The authorizations and appropriations of Title II summarize its fiscal history, and are reflected in Table 1.

TABLE I
FUNDS FOR ESEA-II, 1966-1974

Fiscal Year	Authorization ^a	Appropriation ^a
1966	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000
1967	125,000,000	102,000,000
1968	150,000,000	99,200,000
1969	162,500,000	50,000,000
1970	200,000,000	42,500,000
1971	200,000,000	80,000,000
1972	210,000,000	90,000,000
1973	220,000,000 ^b	100,000,000 ^c
1974	220,000,000 ^e	90,250,000 ^d

^aUnless otherwise noted, source is U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education Division, Office of Education. *Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1973, p. iii.

^b*U.S. Code Annotated*. Title 20, Sect. 821, p. 401, St. Paul, Minn., West Publishing Company, 1974.

^cFrase, Robert W. "Five Years of Struggle for Federal Funds." *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. 19th ed. New York, R. R. Bowker, 1974, p. 157.

^dCooke, Eileen D., and Case, Sara. "Legislation Affecting Librarianship in 1973." *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. 19th ed. New York, R.R. Bowker 1974, p. 131.

^e*Congressional Quarterly Almanac*, 29:525, 1973.

The appropriations reveal the erratic funding of ESEA II but conceal its near extinction in fiscal years (FY) 1970 and 1974 when the President's budget recommended zero funding and the termination of the program. The escalating costs of the Vietnam War and inflation increased Congressional support for rescission of appropriations. In FY 1968, the "2-10 formula" adopted by the administration required every civilian agency to trim 2 percent from programs plus 10 percent of other controllable obligations.⁷ The Vietnam War was also blamed for the 50 percent slash in Title II funds in FY 1969.⁸ President Johnson's budget for FY 1970, submitted prior to the inauguration of President Nixon, recommended a further cut to \$42 million. The new administration revised downward the total Office of Education budget and recommended zero funding for Title II. The new 1970 budget also

eliminated the audiovisual and equipment program (NDEA Title III) while Title I of LSCA was reduced by one-half. These proposed slashes and eliminations brought concerted action from the library, education, and related organizations whose interests were affected. In April 1969 they formed a coalition, the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, which has subsequently participated in legislative battles. Its support salvaged Title II at the funding level originally requested in President Johnson's budget.⁹

Restoration of funds for Title II and renewed confidence in its promise for educational reform came in 1970 when President Nixon singled it out as essential to the success of his proposed "Right to Read" program.¹⁰ His recommendations for \$80 million were approved in both FY 1971 and FY 1972.

The struggle over funds for FY 1973, however, was in the words of one active participant of the Committee for Full Funding the "most bitter, complicated, and protracted of all" (of the five fiscal years 1970-74).¹¹ ESEA appropriations were a part of a large Labor-HEW bill which was sent to the President in August 1972; the bill was vetoed and the veto was upheld in the House. A reduced bill was passed and again vetoed. Funding for FY 1973 was eventually provided by two continuing resolutions, one of which required the President to spend for individual education and library programs the lower of the House or Senate figures in the first vetoed Labor-HEW bill for FY 1973. Although the President signed this continuing resolution in March 1973, he ignored its provisions and expended for programs only the amounts in his budget. For Title II, his actions withheld \$10 million of the \$100 million mandated in the continuing resolution.

In the 1974 budget transmitted by the President in January 1973, the administration eliminated all federal programs for libraries and educational materials and equipment as a part of a massive termination of federal grant programs in education, health, and welfare. In his rationale, the President described a "redefined federal role" which would restore a greater responsibility to the state and local levels and curtail reliance on the federal government. The House and Senate, however, rejected this concept and passed an appropriations bill which continued among other grants the funding of the separate titles in ESEA. The President signed the bill into law after eliciting a compromise from Congress which permitted him to cut 5 percent from each program exceeding his budget request. The administration also responded on December 19, 1973, to the U.S. District Court order to release impounded FY 1973 HEW funds to the states.¹²

ESEA Title II

That ESEA II, born in 1965 as a politically expedient measure, had elicited popular support during its ten years of existence is evidenced by its treatment in the first major revision of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Education Amendments of 1974, signed by President Ford on August 21, 1974 (PL 93-380), continue authorization of funding for libraries and learning resources, but encourage the consolidation of such funding with two other categorical titles.

Libraries and Learning Resources, Title IV of the new ESEA, combines three categorical programs in a block grant for each of the states to distribute to its local education agencies: ESEA Title II, school library resources; NDEA Title III, educational equipment; and ESEA Title III, guidance, counseling and testing. The consolidation will be effected if two conditions are met: (1) forward funding, which requires Congress to appropriate funds for Libraries and Learning Resources one year in advance, so that schools may plan ahead for the use of federal money; and (2) maintenance of federal funding at a specified annual level, which stipulates that Congress cannot reduce funding for the programs included in Libraries and Learning Resources below the level of the preceding fiscal year or the FY 1974 level, whichever is higher. If these two conditions are not met, the existing categorical ESEA Title II school library program will be authorized instead. The new law provides for a transitional phase-in, so that in the first year of the consolidation, the 1975-76 school year and FY 1976, only 50 percent of the funds would be consolidated with the remainder allotted to the three separate categorical programs. In FY 1977, 100 percent of the funds would go into the consolidated program.¹³

When and if consolidation occurs, each local education agency will completely control its allotment of the funds among the three programs. The maintenance of effort provisions require only that the total amount expended on these programs from non-federal sources will equal the amount so expended for the preceding fiscal year. Thus, the amounts provided locally to libraries for materials could be increased or reduced each year while the local agency still met the stipulation for maintenance of effort for the consolidated program.¹⁴

The annual authorization for the new ESEA Title IV is \$395 million for FY 1976 and "such sums as necessary" for 1977 and 1978. If funds are not appropriated for the new Title IV, ESEA II—the old categorical library resources title—is authorized at \$220 million annually through FY 1978.¹⁵

Thus, ESEA II appears to have succeeded to the degree that its

potential is incorporated in the new public law. Whether the potential is realized appears to depend at this writing on the initiative and leadership of school librarians at the local level.

An objective review of ESEA II requires, however, an examination of its provisions and its impact upon the children and teachers for whom it was instituted.

PROVISIONS OF ESEA II

The five-year ESEA II program initiated in FY 1966 offered grants to the states to acquire school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for use by public and private elementary and secondary school children and teachers. It required that each state plan for the operation and administration of the program based on the criteria specified in the law, foremost of which was the provision to "take into consideration the relative need of the children and teachers of the State for such library resources."¹⁶

The state plan had to be approved by the U.S. Office of Education and became the contract under which the state operated. Funding for the state was determined according to the ratio of public and private school enrollment to the total enrollment in all states and the District of Columbia. Funds were also allotted to the outlying areas of the nation and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Department of Defense schools.

Three categories of materials were eligible: school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials. Defined as library resources were books, periodicals, pamphlets, maps, globes, sound recordings, processed slides, transparencies, films, filmstrips, videotapes or any other printed and published materials of a similar nature. "Other instructional materials" were identical with library resources except that they were not processed or "organized for use." "Textbooks" meant books, reusable workbooks, or manuals used as a principal source of study material, a copy of which is required by each student.

Selection was to be the responsibility of the state and local education agency, but each state was to develop criteria to insure the purchase of quality materials. Materials were to have a life expectancy of more than one year. Equipment, shelving and furniture were excluded from the plan.

The state plan was to set forth the criteria determining relative need of children and teachers for library resources and the proportions of

ESEA Title II

the allocation for the three categories of materials. The priorities for the provision of materials were to include factors such as instructional requirements, quality and quantity of available materials, requirements of children and teachers in special or exemplary unit programs, the cultural or linguistic needs of children or teachers, economic need, and the previous and current financial efforts in relation to financial ability. The regulations noted that distribution of resources solely on a per capita basis did not satisfy this provision.

States were also required to insure that Title II funds were not substituted for local or state appropriations for materials since the purpose of the legislation was to encourage additional support for library and instructional resources.

The administration of Title II was vested in a state agency responsible for: formulating policies to make the program's resources available to all children in the schools of the state; developing and disseminating standards for the selection and use of materials; supervising and evaluating programs for the acquisition of materials; maintaining and reporting essential data and inventories. The amount permitted the state agency for administration was not to exceed \$50,000 or 5 percent of its Title II payment, whichever was greater.

Although this paper focuses on ESEA II because of its direct aid to school libraries, the contributions of other federal programs should be noted. Foremost among earlier legislation was Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which has provided matching grants to the states for equipment and materials and minor remodeling of classrooms, laboratories and audiovisual libraries for elementary and secondary school subjects. Originally limited to science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, Title III was expanded in 1964 to include history, civics, geography, English, and reading. NDEA III could be used to buy equipment for projecting the audiovisual materials procured under ESEA II.

ESEA Titles I and III, however, afforded a potential gold mine for school library development. Title I, targeted for education of children from low-income families, and Title III, targeted for experimentation and innovation to improve the quality of education, permitted expenditures for professional and supportive staff as well as equipment and materials. The states could and did coordinate ESEA II with these programs. For example, Title I invested heavily in personnel and facilities for reading programs while Title II supplied materials. The exemplary programs developed under Title III included resource centers and media projects to which Title II allotted special purpose

funds. ESEA Title V strengthened state departments of education and increased the consultative and technical assistance they could make available to local communities in using the Title II grants.¹⁷

The pre-service and continuing education of school librarians to prepare them for the expanded role of the emerging library media program has been assisted by short- and long-term institutes funded first under NDEA Title XI, and since 1968 under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act.

That much federal legislation aids school libraries without specific mention of them has been emphasized repeatedly by school librarians concerned with federal aid. Their message is: know your federal legislation and use it to improve your school library service. The diligent, albeit only partially successful efforts of school librarians to retain categorical aid offered in ESEA II suggest, however, that librarians prefer direct assistance to indirect. The key question, even though somewhat rhetorical in light of the revised ESEA legislation is: What have been the results of ESEA II?

IMPACT OF ESEA II

The major studies of the impact of Title II upon the educational program of the school have been conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education. The studies were designed to evaluate the effect of increased instructional materials on the improvement of instruction and on pupil achievement. Two were case studies of (1) schools with libraries which had none prior to the Title II program,¹⁸ and (2) schools with special purpose grants for demonstration of exemplary media programs.¹⁹ The third was a comprehensive survey of a sample of school districts in the United States.²⁰ Involved in the initial planning of these studies were library/media and evaluation specialists from the Office of Education and state education agencies. A national conference (February 1968) and a series of regional conferences (July 1968) with evaluation staff from state departments of education and local school districts were used to review the scope and the instruments of the survey and to enlist cooperation in its conduct.

The case studies focused on schools at opposite ends of the continuum of school library media program development. The nine elementary schools in cities serving children from low-income families were representative of the schools enrolling 10 million elementary pupils which, prior to ESEA II, lacked libraries and which Title II had been designed to help. Criteria for the schools selected for study were:

ESEA Title II

the media center had been established since the inception of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the media center had some professional staff; the school was in a ghetto. The eight schools (three elementary, three junior high, two senior high) with demonstration projects were sufficiently experienced with and committed to media programs that they had been selected by the state education agency to receive a special purpose grant to acquire exemplary materials, facilities, equipment and personnel that they might serve as demonstrations for other schools in the region. The schools in both groups had coordinated funds from two or more federal programs with those from local and state sources to support their media programs. Any impact identified in the studies is, therefore, not limited to Title II.

The methodology of both studies was essentially identical. The survey instruments included guides for collecting data about materials, equipment and staff, and interview guides for use with principals, selected (or volunteer) teachers and selected students. On-site interviews were conducted by staff members from the Office of Education and school media specialists from state education agencies, library science and media programs in universities, and school library supervisory offices in large city school systems. The resulting data were, therefore, quantitative facts about the components of the program and opinions of those concerned with it, either as clientele or directors.

The nine new elementary media centers in the inner cities of Cleveland, Buffalo, and Los Angeles had much in common. In materials and equipment they were grossly inadequate: book collections ranged from 2.6 per student to 4.8 as compared to the 10 recommended by the national standards; filmstrip viewers were usually the only audiovisual equipment available, and four of the nine schools lacked them; staff, space, and facilities were limited. Nonetheless, a start had been made and ESEA II was credited with the impetus for the establishment of the media centers and as the incentive for an increase in local funds for media center materials in Los Angeles and Cleveland and in state funds in Buffalo.

The greatest impact of the media center was made on the pupils. Almost all the randomly sampled students interviewed said they enjoyed going to the media center because they liked to read and because the materials there helped them in their school work. Enthusiasm for reading, however, had not raised their reading scores since the establishment of the media center. Many were vocal in their

suggestions for improvement. Desires high on their list were: to go to the center more often; to have more materials (often noting specific complaints); to have more librarians to help them. In all the schools surveyed, a policy of rigid schedules of class visits limited the accessibility of the resources of the center and inhibited their potential impact on instruction.

The opinions of teachers and principals varied to a great extent about the influence of the establishment of the media center on changes in the instructional program and on teaching methods. Both groups agreed that the potential of media center materials for influencing change was great. Teachers gave high marks to those services which are basic to any library media center: organizing materials, making them accessible, and helping children use them.

The eight schools where demonstrations projects had been funded under ESEA II were chosen on the basis of: (1) grade level (as noted above); (2) location—two in New York, two in North Carolina, and one each in California and Oregon; (3) type of community—from a bedroom community in a Kansas City suburb to an agricultural community in California; (4) enrollment—from 435 to 1,404; and (5) amount of Title II grant—from \$5,228 to \$58,810. The objectives of the special grants varied for each school, but all related to improving students' learning through the media program.

Materials, facilities, equipment and personnel in the eight schools were rated exemplary for the most part. They achieved this excellence by having substantial local and state support and by using grants from two or more federal programs—ESEA I, II, III and NDEA III. The impact of the program was judged primarily on the basis of opinion elicited in interviews with 345 teachers and 673 students.

Teachers were queried about changes in curriculum and instruction, utilization of materials, attitudes of parents and administrators, and pupil behavior. Sample items in these categories were: increased materials have contributed to individualization of instruction; teacher interest in using materials in classroom instruction has increased; parents have become more aware of the media center; there is more cooperation between media staff and most classroom teachers; the increase in materials has contributed to student learning and achievement. Change was to be indicated as one of three degrees—to a great extent, to a limited extent, not at all. More than half the teachers asserted that the additional resources had effected change to a great extent in thirty-one of the thirty-four questions asked.

The most difficult items for teachers to assess accurately (in the

ESEA Title II

opinion of this critic) were summary questions in each category which asked, e.g.: What changes in pupil behavior can be attributed to the Title II special purpose grant? It is questionable whether teachers could distinguish the impact of materials from different funds.

Five of the eight principals and more than one-third of the teachers believed the increment in materials and services had only slightly changed the curriculum content. The principals and media specialists agreed with the majority of teachers on other questions and credited extensive changes to the improvement of the media program.

The students noted items "liked best" about their school media center and those "liked least." Of the "liked best" items, over one-half voted for the caliber of the materials collection. Many commented, however, that more materials were needed. Apparently increased use of the media center increased student awareness of its deficiencies. Students expressing dislikes referred to the need for more materials, often by specific content or form; the need for more space; the need for a school policy allowing for more time in the media center; the need for more staff assistance. Over 80 percent of the students said they and their fellow students used the media center more because of the new books and other materials necessary for school work.

What do the results of the two groups of case studies reveal about the impact of Title II upon pupils, teachers and learning? First, they suggest the impossibility of isolating the effect of Title II resources from those of other funds. Second, they offer no data about improvements in learning. Only in the inner-city schools were before-and-after reading scores collected, and they revealed no marked change. Third, they document pupils' positive attitudes toward the media program and their desire for more and better materials, more school hours in the center and more staff to help them. Fourth, they reveal the striking disparity between a rudimentary media center and a quality center which meets national standards. Teachers and administrators believe that a quality program with adequate resources, staff and plant becomes a laboratory for learning and an integral part of the instructional program. The beginning programs lack sufficient resources and equipment to change curriculum or teaching methods significantly, although principal and teachers have faith in their potential. Fifth, they suggest that it is essential for the library media specialist to participate in the entire instructional program.

The third and most comprehensive of the evaluations of Title II undertaken by the Office of Education was national in scope and

covered the first three fiscal years of program operation. The survey, following the planning noted above, was conducted during 1968. The sample consisted of 482 school districts, stratified by enrollment. Within the districts, 1,291 elementary and 705 secondary schools were selected by random sampling. Questionnaires were directed to school principals, to school media personnel, and, with supplements for public schools and private schools, to the school district. The response was 90.7 percent of the elementary schools and 87.7 percent of the secondary schools. Data on private schools were obtained by each school district completing the "Private School Supplement" questionnaire.

The survey asked four questions: (1) Is the intent of the statute being carried out? (2) Does the program effect the goals of the statute? (3) Have the possibilities of the law been realized? (4) Should the law be revised?

Title II sought "the upgrading of quantity and quality of instructional materials." Survey data indicated that the law's achievement was commensurate with its checkbook. The goals (question 2) referred to specific provisions in the statute: (1) to distribute equitably materials to children and teachers in public and private schools; (2) to distribute materials on the basis of relative need; (3) to maintain and increase state and local financial support for instructional materials; and (4) to insure availability, selection and standards for materials.

Almost all eligible public and private schools participated in the Title II program—evidence of the equitability of distribution of Title II resources between them. State and local sources provided the greatest proportion of funds for instructional materials. Title II supplemented these funds and encouraged an increase in state and local funding. Nonetheless, only 16 percent of the school districts met or exceeded the 1960 standards of the ALA. The total of materials available (library books, audiovisual materials, and other materials) failed to meet state standards in more than 50 percent of the secondary schools.²⁰

The survey reports that selection adheres to criteria specified in state plans. Media specialists, teachers, and curricular personnel cooperate in selection. School library resources relate better to curricular and student needs. The collections fell short in high-interest, low-vocabulary books, in trade books for basic collections, and in audiovisual materials. Of the schools surveyed, the proportion with media centers increased from 52 to 85 percent, largely in elementary schools; however, 19 percent of the elementary schools and 6 percent

ESEA Title II

of the secondary schools still lacked them.²¹

As a result of Title II, the survey reports, there was a significant increase in the use of the media center by students for class assignments and for pleasure reading. Teachers more often evaluated and selected materials and asked for help from media personnel in locating them. The negligible increase in instruction and team teaching by media staff was attributed to the lack of materials in many schools, which may have discouraged teachers from changing their teaching methods. The survey testified that Title II had stimulated employment of media personnel but that many schools, especially elementary schools, lack such staff.²²

Revisions in the law are suggested. Additional funds are essential for administration of Title II at both the state and local levels. The state, in particular, needs a staff adequate to plan, evaluate and disseminate information as well as to manage the distribution and control of materials. A clearer definition in the law of the criterion of relative need is recommended. School district personnel require direction in the application of relative need formulae in allotting funds within school districts. Although state agencies employ relative need criteria in administering Title II, the survey found the operation of relative need factors seldom evident in local school districts.²³

To increase the impact of Title II, the survey recommends funding to the level of authorization. During the initial three years, Title II has contributed about 8 percent of the annual cost of instructional materials; an increase to at least 16 percent and, if possible, to 25 percent is urged. The report warns of the need for safeguards in the event of grant consolidation to assure a fair share of funds for instructional materials because "the unmet and continuing needs for such materials are so great and their role in supporting instruction is so vital."²⁴

The survey contributes benchmark data about the use of Title II funds. Its detailed quantitative analyses of the distribution and results of the program are complemented by the in-depth reporting in the case studies of interviews with the teachers, students, and media specialists in direct contact with the resources Title II made possible.

Annual reports of the Office of Education offer aggregate data compiled from state education agency reports about the expenditure of funds, categories of instructional materials purchased under Title II, and its use in strengthening instruction through improved resources and services. A noteworthy feature of the Title II programs detailed in these reports was the special purpose grant program which

thirty-one states had used during the three years of operation summarized in the 1968 report.²⁵ Its purpose was to demonstrate the impact upon instruction and students' learning of a library adequate in quantity, quality and variety, and under the direction of a creative librarian. The materials provided from the special purpose grants supported a variety of curricular programs, art and humanities, social studies, vocational education and the needs of special groups of children—the handicapped, the emotionally disturbed in state institutions, the academically talented, and those for whom English is a second language. The 1972 report reflects the emphasis accorded reading after Title II helped fund the Right to Read Program.²⁶ A special U.S.O.E. periodical, *ESEA Title II and the Right to Read, Notable Reading Projects*, explains the projects, including their objectives and plan of evaluation.²⁷

The ERIC data bank makes available reports from numerous school districts which mounted special programs through funds received from ESEA Titles I, II, and III. The only attempt to synthesize the findings of these local experiments is in the Office of Education annual reports which abstract the narratives from each state education agency.

The implications of one such study, the Sobrante Park Evaluation, noted by Cyr, underscore the central difficulty in evaluation of media projects.²⁸ The Sobrante Park Project, using special funds from ESEA II, created a media program in an inner-city Oakland, California, school.²⁹ The evaluation was based on the opinions of those who benefited from or were involved with the use of the center. Parents as well as teachers believed the media center had helped to improve their children's academic performance. Teachers rated highest the media center's favorable impact on student motivation and enlargement of their general knowledge. Children enjoyed the center, and asked for more materials and more conference rooms. But the study reported no improvement in the children's scores on standardized reading tests. Cyr argues that the reading achievement test is a questionable indicator of the value of media programs. She submits that library/media specialists are primarily concerned with motivating students, stimulating their intellectual curiosity, exciting them about reading for fun. Their help to students in formal learning is indirect, through helping teachers. The Sobrante Park Project points up the impact of the media center while renewing the issue of appropriate objectives for the media program.

Many studies have tried to determine the influence of federal aid on education. While they do not usually isolate funding of school

ESEA Title II

libraries, they nonetheless point up relevant limitations of federal funding. For example, Berke and Kirst investigated the impact of federal aid on the finances of public school systems. A major question was whether poor districts were helped more or less than wealthier ones. The study covered the period 1965-68 and attempted to trace payments to school districts in six states from eight federal programs, including ESEA II. Its chief criticism of Title II was the ambiguity in the law and in the Office of Education regulations about the criterion of "relative need." Berke and Kirst found examples in which major cities received less aid from ESEA II than justified by their proportion of the state's pupil population. Allowing for the more costly needs of central city students, the discrimination became more evident.³⁰

In a synthesis of studies about the effect of federally stimulated change in education, Kirst deplors the scanty information available on pupil attainment in the program even as he admits the difficulty of documenting such influence. (The school library resources program is not alone in its failure here.) He credits categorical programs for getting new things started but notes the paucity of data on whether they keep going. Although pessimistic about the lasting impact of federal demonstrations, he acknowledges that without them reporting innovation would be limited.³¹

In sum, the growth of school library resources resulting from federal aid and increased support from state and local funds has been insufficient to remove the inadequacies which led to the enactment of ESEA II. The statement in the 1968 report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries remains valid: "Recent Federal legislation has already had visible impact on elementary and secondary school library development, in part by encouraging much greater local effort in library improvement. Nevertheless, and in spite of differences from one system to another, the needs of our schools in general for books and other library materials, for adequate physical facilities in which to house libraries, and for staff are so enormous that continued Federal assistance is necessary."³²

The special needs of poor children, particularly in urban schools with impoverished libraries, should be recognized, and the regulations should be clarified about "relative need." The increase in federal aid for school library resources recommended by the Office of Education could aid the poor and at the same time stimulate improvement of library and instructional resources for children in outlying areas. In short, the cities need a larger slice of the loaf, but the loaf itself needs to be bigger.

Provisions for the staff required to administer the library resources program have been unrealistic. The allotment of 5 percent of the state Title II share or \$50,000 (whichever is greater) to the state education agency has prohibited employing sufficient personnel offering the leadership and guidance required to plan judicious use of federal funds and, at the same time, to manage reporting, at both the state and local levels. Erratic funding of Title II has handicapped the state agency in securing and holding staff.

The omission in federal legislation for professional school library media staff at the local level is a major weakness, particularly for elementary schools, many of which are without libraries. The media specialist or librarian is essential to integrating learning resources with the school's instructional program.

If the consolidation authorized by Title IV of the Education Amendments of 1974 occurs, school libraries may have continuing support for resources and additional incentive to apply for grants for audiovisual equipment. The consolidation encouraged in Title IV may offer a source for funding professional library/media staff at both the local and state levels. Critical, however, will be the ability of school media specialists to convince the educational community—administrators, faculty, parents and educational organizations—of the need and worth of the school library media program. If they fail, federal funds formerly earmarked for library resources will flow to other programs. The new legislation appears to retard school library development because it no longer guarantees funds for instructional materials and equipment. If it spurs school library media specialists to greater efforts in relating media and instruction, it could be a blessing in disguise.

References

1. U.S. Congress. 89 Cong., 1 Sess. "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965." *United States Statutes at Large*. Vol. 79. Public Law 89-10. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1966, p. 36.
2. U.S. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: Report to Accompany H.R. 2362*. 89 Cong., 1 Sess., S. Rept. 146, p. 21.
3. Leach, Richard D. "A Broad Look at the Federal Government and Libraries." In Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse, eds. *Libraries at Large; Tradition, Innovation, and the National Interest*. New York, Bowker, 1969, p. 367.
4. Bailey, Stephen K., and Mosher, Edith K. *ESEA; the Office of Education Administers a Law*. Syracuse, N.Y., Syracuse University Press, 1968, p. 21.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

ESEA Title II

7. Krettek, Germaine, and Cooke, Eileen D. "Federal Legislation." In *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, Bowker, 1968, p. 177.
8. Geller, Evelyn. "Summary of Title II-A Grants." In *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, Bowker, 1969, p. 116.
9. Frase, Robert W. "Five Years of Struggle for Federal Funds," *Publishers Weekly*, 205:64, Jan. 21, 1974.
10. Mahar, Mary H., and Jones, Milbrey L. "ESEA, Title II and the Right to Read Effort," *School Libraries*, 20:31-36, Fall 1970.
11. Frase, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
12. Cooke, Eileen D., and Case, Sara. "Legislation Affecting Librarianship in 1973." In Madeline Miele, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, Bowker, 1974, pp. 130-34.
13. "Educational Amendments of 1974," *American Libraries*, 5:574, Nov. 1974.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*
16. U.S. Congress, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
17. Sutherland, Louise. "School Library Legislation at the Federal Level," *Library Trends*, 19:195-96, Oct. 1970.
18. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. *Descriptive Case Studies of Nine Elementary School Media Centers in Three Inner Cities: Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Printed and Published Instructional Materials*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1969.
19. ————. *Emphasis on Excellence in School Media Programs: Descriptive Case Studies, Special-Purpose Grant Programs. Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., May 1969.
20. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of Libraries and Learning Resources. *An Evaluation Survey Report of ESEA Title II-Fiscal Year 1966-68. Part I. Analysis and Interpretation. Part II. Tables, 1972*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., pp. 69-70.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 75.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
24. *Ibid.*
25. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. *Third Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1968, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1971, p. 58.
26. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Education Division. *Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972, Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 89-10 as Amended); School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1973.
27. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. *ESEA Title II and the Right to Read, Notable Reading Projects*.

MARGARET HAYES GRAZIER

Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., March, May, July, Sept., Nov., 1971; Jan., March, May, July, Sept., Nov., 1972; Jan., March, May, July, 1973.

28. Cyr, Helen W. "The Sobrante Park Evaluation Project," *School Libraries*, 20:22-26, Fall 1970.

29. Oakland Public Schools, Division of Instructional Media. *An Evaluation Report on the Multi-Media Services Project: Sobrante Park School*. Oakland, Ca., Oakland Public Schools, Feb. 1970.

30. Berke, Joel S., and Kirst, Michael W. *Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? Who Governs?* Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath, 1972, pp. 393, 400.

31. Kirst, Michael W. "The Growth of Federal Influence in Education." In National Society for the Study of Education. *Uses of the Sociology of Education* (Seventy-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Part II. Chicago, National Society for the Study of Education, 1974, pp. 464, 466, 474.

32. U.S. National Advisory Commission on Libraries. "Library Services for the Nation's Needs." In Knight and Nourse, *op. cit.*, p. 508.

Title I ("Title One". Financial Assistance To Local Educational Agencies For The Education Of Children Of Low-Income Families, the newly migrated, the abused for improvement of schools and specifically dropout prevention. Title II. School Library Resources, Textbooks, and other Instructional Materials. Title III. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services. Title IV. Educational Research And Training. Title V. Grants To Strengthen State Departments Of Education. Title VI. General Provisions.