

Evaluation of Children's Services

MARY K. CHELTON

Introduction

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER is to discuss program evaluation concepts and methods, with specific attention to the ways in which they can be applied to children's services. The special developmental, demographic, and political factors that may enhance or inhibit the use of program evaluation by librarians serving children will also be addressed, and examples of program evaluation instruments now used in several libraries will be appended for consideration, replication, or adaptation by interested readers.

The article is not intended to be a comprehensive overview but rather a clear basic delineation and defense of the process with resources noted for further self-study. In fact, an attitude of self-study is intrinsic to the entire concept of evaluation; without it, most techniques are useless. To be an evaluator, one must care enough about what one does to subject it to careful scrutiny without resentment. Since many children's librarians are already resentful about doing important work for little money, status, or recognition, evaluation may be automatically suspect. The article is based on the premise that children's services are too important *not* to be evaluated!

There are some important differences between the concept presented in this article and traditional concepts of evaluation in public libraries. Until the last fifteen years, evaluation of library services consisted almost exclusively of measuring oneself against national or state

Mary K. Chelton is Programming and Community Services Administrator, Virginia Beach Department of Public Libraries, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

standards. These standards were highly prescriptive in terms of the number and qualifications of staff, materials, and square footage. They were generally derived from peer-accepted "best practice" in existing libraries, with some political compromises to make them reasonably attainable by most libraries.¹

The problem with these prescriptive standards, beyond their obviously self-serving nature, became apparent in the 1960s when a group of researchers from the Rutgers library school began looking at the differences among the "outputs" of similar libraries, all of which met the prescriptive "inputs." They quickly found that putting standard resources (i.e., staff, materials, space, etc.) into a library did not necessarily assure that standard activities (i.e., circulation per capita, percentage of reference questions filled per questions asked, program attendance per capita, etc.) would come out of it. Thus the conceptualization of prior library standards was shown to be faulty, and the profession then started to look critically not only at what different libraries were doing with different resources but also at whether the libraries should adhere to any external prescriptive standards unrelated to local institutional objectives at all.²

To say that the idea of prescriptive standards died hard among children's librarians—especially in the public library—is a vast understatement evidenced by their continued publication in the mid-1980s.³ Why such resistance continues is open to conjecture, although in fairness it is not all inclusive. In 1985, a formal feasibility test of the Public Library Association's (PLA) *Output Measures* methodology was conducted with a group of Wisconsin's children's librarians,⁴ and a program on output measures was held at the ALA annual conference by the PLA Library Service to Children Committee.

While the techniques described in this article may extend those measures promulgated by PLA and since they are not aimed at a strictly juvenile population, the bias of the author is definitely toward the means by which local children's services can be shown to be effective, rather than toward the degree to which they meet externally imposed prescriptions that may have nothing to do with local history, resources, or needs.

Evaluation—What It Is Not

Since there is a pervasive tendency among youth-serving librarians to perceive evaluation as either an attack by a hostile administrator, or a once-and-for-all measure of ultimate worth, the following statements

Evaluation of Children's Services

are designed to dispel mythology about what evaluation is or is not.

(1) *Evaluation is not the way by which one's ultimate worth is measured.* In fact, for one seeking assurance of ultimate worth, evaluation should probably be avoided for mental health. That evaluation can be a distinctly threatening activity is quite clearly delineated by Chelimsky:

Wildavsky points out that "If you don't know how to make an evaluation, it may be a problem for you but not for anyone else. If you do know how to evaluate, it becomes a problem for others." In fact, a major problem in the use of evaluation has been the threat it poses.... First, an evaluation report is public information which, once generated, cannot be kept secret or limited to the private use of the decision-maker. Thus, it provides persons other than the responsible decision-maker with information which may adversely affect that decision-maker. Second, it is a force for change. It seeks ways to improve an existing set of activities, no matter what the purpose of the evaluation...improvement always involves change, rather than the status quo, and change can appear threatening. As James Abert has put it: "The setting of program objectives and the choosing of evaluations are in themselves very emotional undertakings. Program managers generally are not anxious to do it. In fact, trust, confidence, honor, and many of the more noble aspects of life seem to be strongly challenged by evaluation."⁵

(2) *Evaluation is not always complicated.* An example of a deceptively simple evaluation, easily adaptable to children's services, is the Lodestar project carried out by the Patrick Henry Branch of the Fairfax County (Virginia) Public Library in spring 1985. After determining that young adults were an underserved market, the librarians designed a program series with a specific logo (the Lodestar) targeted to the adolescent age group that culminated in a contest to win a star which would then be named for the contest winner. Promotion of the series involved speaking to all the English teachers in local schools and distributing tickets through them to their students for the contest. To actually enter, however, the young adults had to drop off their tickets at the library. Thus, the objective of raising awareness of the library among an underserved group was evaluated (measured) by the number of entries returned divided by the number of entry tickets given out. This process could easily be adapted to measure summer reading club promotion in specifically targeted schools.

Admittedly, this evaluation only measured the effectiveness of the promotion, not the return visits of those introduced to the library this way nor the proportion of young adults for whom this was a first visit, but it was appropriate for what it did, and it was simple. Many librar-

ians promote their programs in a total vacuum; however, in Fairfax County they decided how the program would be measured at the same time that they planned the program.

Another example of a deceptively simple evaluation comes from the Wolfsohn Public Library in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania (see appendix A). When the children's librarians there initiated a toddler story hour, they adapted a one-page evaluation form which asked parents of participating toddlers not only to observe their children at and between story hours to record their impressions of the process of the program, but also to observe the program's impact on their toddlers over time.⁶ This is a more sophisticated method because it involves nonlibrary staff, requires voluntary cooperation, and measures more than one aspect; it is, however, simple.

(3) *Evaluation will not always prove what you want it to.* A prime example of this was a feasibility study conducted in 1985 by the author of taping in-house picture-book storytime programs for rebroadcast on cable television. The study consisted of taking a sample of titles in present use by staff in Virginia Beach (Virginia) Public Libraries, mailing request letters for permission to broadcast to the publishers of these titles on a particular day, and then tracking the response time and the percentage of positive responses to determine whether one could do such a program and how long it would take to organize it. Since there was a significant amount of anecdotal evidence that the publisher did not always hold the copyright and that repeat mailings might be necessary, the rate of such repeat mailings was also noted.⁷ The results indicated in table 1 show that, for this series at least, it was possible not only to receive enough free broadcast permissions to have a viable program series, but also that the program could be set up within a four-month-period.

One would have to replicate this process successively with different samples of titles and study the differences among the results before deciding whether these permission and response rates held true in general or just for this particular sample. In this instance, though, an evaluative study disproved the previously held belief that copyright clearance presented a serious hurdle to planning such a program.

(4) *Evaluation is not always quantitative (i.e., counting things) even when the results are presented and analyzed numerically.* The cable storytime study offers a good example of this concept. The actual method involved sending the same letter to twenty-four publishers on the same day and then tracking the responses to see what patterns emerged. The Center for Early Adolescence evaluated client satisfaction

Evaluation of Children's Services

TABLE 1
CABLE STORYTIME FEASIBILITY STUDY
(see appendix B for specific titles)

<i>Inquiries to Publishers</i>		<i>Number of Titles: 42</i>		<i>Response from Publishers</i>	
Initial letters	24	Initial responses	18		
Additional	6	Additional	4		
Total	30	Total	22		
				(73% of Publishers)	
Turnaround Time		Fees			
One month	8	Free (1 time only)	9		
Two months	8	Free (3 times only)	5		
Three months	6	Free (unlimited)	8		
Total	22	Total free	22 (52% titles)		
		Fee required	3 (7% titles)		
		Range: \$25 - \$500			

with after school programs by asking the young adolescent participants a structured series of forced-choice and open-ended questions. The process was systematic and evaluative because they asked the same questions of participants at different sites thereby establishing a basis of comparison (see appendix C).

Reference services to adults have been evaluated by means of the proxy patron method whereby a proxy patron asks a real reference question to see not only if one gets an answer but also what kind of answer.⁸ This method could be used by children's librarians to evaluate reference service to older children and/or young adolescents. It is a more useful method than the "reference fill rate" of *Output Measures* because the quality of the answer can be studied as well as the interpersonal climate within which the answer was given. Unfortunately, this method is more difficult to administer than the simpler fill rate.

(5) *Evaluation does not solve problems; it only provides the evidence needed to solve problems.* For example, an administrator who feels that a specialized children's services staff is inflexible and expensive, as opposed to generalists who, theoretically, can work equally well with all ages, may be given pause by a well-designed descriptive evaluation study which documents the number of adults served by the children's staff and the activities pursued by the children's staff when children are not in the library. The evidence from the study may not totally erase the bias, but it will possibly help point out that the problem is bias and not fact. The study might also prove that the director is

correct about inflexibility and allow the children's staff to look at themselves objectively, based on facts rather than resentment. Evaluation is not without risk.

Evaluation—What It Is

Evaluation is the means by which a program, service, or activity is shown to have or have not worked or to examine what might work. It involves a systematic and explicit comparison of what actually occurred with what was planned. As a recent tutorial in *American Libraries* (October 1985 to February 1986) put it, evaluation asks the question, "Are we there yet?"⁹ Other definitions include:

...the process of determining whether something is what you want it to be.¹⁰

...examining and weighing a phenomenon against some explicit or implicit yardstick.¹¹

...an attempt to devise in some formal way a procedure for obtaining evidence or assessing how well a goal or objective...has been met.¹²

A systematic way to observe and describe what and how well you are doing to yourself and to others....¹³

Evaluation is an intrinsic part of program design. The methods by which progress will be measured must be part of the original conceptualization process. One cannot decide after the fact that it would be nice to know if a particular activity (e.g., nursery school visits) had a particular result (e.g., increased interest in books) if the method by which the result is measured (e.g., a survey of nursery school staff before and after the visit; circulation to those children/families/staff, etc.) is not built into the data-gathering process of the program at the outset. It is especially important to evaluate programs being done for the first time to establish a baseline. This simply means a record against which future efforts can be compared.

The intentions (objectives) of a program should be clearly stated and measurable because the presence or absence of such objectives determine not only whether a program can be evaluated or not but also what measurement is most appropriate. A good example is the ubiquitous summer reading club. If the stated objective is to encourage children to read over the summer, then the percentage increase in circulation of juvenile materials or the percentage increase in new juvenile card registrations during the summer months might be useful measures. If on the other hand the objective is to maintain reading skills over the summer, then such measures are imprecise. A better measure

Evaluation of Children's Services

would be before and after assessments of reading test scores, comparing similar children who did and did not participate in the summer reading club. Ironically, in the evaluation of most summer reading programs, the second objective is intended, but it is measured by the first set of measures, or worse, only by documentation of increased or decreased participation rates without any attention to the percentage of repeaters (i.e., the effect of repeated participation) among those participating.

An evaluation is done through a series of observations which simply means "any method used to gather data."¹⁴ Frequently the observation method is of necessity some type of survey. An entire body of knowledge is available about survey research. One of the best overviews of the subject is an article by Barbara Moran in which she says:

Taken step by step, survey research is relatively easy to do. Much help is available to beginning researchers from those already familiar with the method and from books on the topic. The first survey is the most difficult, but with careful planning, major errors can be avoided. Doing research is a lot like swimming; the only way to learn is to get in the water.¹⁵

Appropriate evaluation methods attempt to control for a variety of "threats" to their validity in attributing an effect to the program rather than to external forces outside the control of the program manager or to unintentional bias on his or her part. The possibility of a cumulative effect from repeated enrollment in the summer reading club program is an example of a factor an evaluator of that program should control for if by no other means than at least by documenting repeaters so they can be compared with first timers.

Levels of Evaluation

There are three distinct levels of evaluation, and it is important to understand the differences among them not only because they are intended to do different things, but also because the sophistication and resources needed to accomplish them increase with each level.

The first level is called a *process evaluation*. This level of evaluation measures the efficiency of the way in which a program is organized (i.e., the process of the program). In a process evaluation, the various elements of a program are reviewed, usually through descriptive record-keeping. This review looks at the way in which the individual program elements are activated and relate to each other. A very good example of such an evaluation is the assessment done by the children's coordinator of the New Hanover County (North Carolina) Library. Using an instru-

ment designed for the purpose (see appendix D), she isolated each component of the story hour process and rated the program giver who presented it. Besides assessing the quality of the program by examining its process, this method is extremely useful for identifying gaps in staff training for this program.

Another kind of process evaluation which most children's librarians do intuitively is observing peak use times within the library and matching staff schedules accordingly. The actual documentation of these patterns has led in some libraries not only to more efficient staff scheduling, but also to better hours for the children's room itself. This kind of ongoing process evaluation, if well documented, can show not only changes over time but seasonal variations within the same time period.

Richard Windsor, an expert in evaluation research, comments that "the importance of specifying process evaluation procedures during the early stages of program development and introduction cannot be overstressed."¹⁶ The fact that this documentation of process was not initiated when children's services started in the late 19th century is no excuse not to start it now especially when a few on-site researchers have begun to describe it.¹⁷

The second level of evaluation is called *program evaluation*. This term is also used generically to mean all levels of evaluation, but in terms of the specific levels of evaluation its meaning is synonymous with impact or effectiveness. In contrast to merely documenting a process, this level of evaluation attempts to determine whether changes that have happened within a specific population at a specific location occurred because of the program. The Wolfsohn toddler storytime evaluation is an excellent example of a program evaluation design, because it attempts to determine the changes in behavior of the toddlers exposed to the Wolfsohn program.

Another example of a program, as opposed to a process evaluation, would be determining whether attitudes toward reading changed as a result of booktalks by the local children's librarian in a particular classroom or in a class visit to the public library. With the cooperation of the teacher and school librarian, it would be fairly easy to use a standard attitudinal measurement, such as those included in *Motivating Children and Young Adults to Read*,¹⁸ to find out the attitudes of the students toward reading both before and after the booktalks. The evaluation design might be further strengthened by assessing a similar group of children who did not hear booktalks and compare the before and after results of both groups. With a comparison group, the possibil-

Evaluation of Children's Services

ity that the pre-booktalk assessment influenced the post-booktalk one would be controlled for because both groups of similar children would have been exposed to the influence of the assessment but not the influence of the booktalks.

This is essentially the process followed by Joni Bodart, author of *Booktalk*¹⁹ and *Booktalk 2*²⁰ in her dissertation research. One does not, however, need to do a dissertation to implement this kind of evaluation as long as school officials are cooperative.

Measuring a change in attitudes toward reading as a result of booktalks implies that this is the intended impact of the program. If another impact is intended—such as increased circulation by the children who heard the booktalk—another kind of observation method is required. A mere increase in the circulation of the titles used in the booktalk may be too imprecise because it would disguise the effects of peer interaction among children who were exposed to the booktalks and the friends with whom they talked who were not. If the intent of the booktalk program is to promote reading among children or to call attention to “sleepers,” a circulation increase in the titles used in the booktalk would be an appropriate measure. In a program evaluation, the impact of the program and possible effects on it must be sorted out at the time the evaluation design and data gathering are being determined.

A program evaluation attempts to ascertain the presence or absence of a variety of “threats” to the possible effectiveness of a program. Many of these problems can be controlled for by the program administrator from the beginning, or, if not controlled for, they can be examined retrospectively to explain a lack of impact unfairly ascribed to the program.

The most familiar threat is called *history* in evaluation jargon. This is the unexpected snowstorm that keeps an audience away on what otherwise seemed to be an ideal night for an evening holiday story hour, or the television movie that results in indifference to an outstanding booktalk. Essentially, history is any extraneous event over which the program planner has little control and which interferes with the impact of the program. Of all the threats, history is the hardest to control but the easiest to explain after the fact. There is probably not a children's librarian working who has not already experienced it.

A second threat is called *maturiation*, which means simply that the program is being evaluated while it is still immature enough that the “kinks” of immaturity (i.e., inexperienced staff or participants) are unduly influencing possible effectiveness. An example might be something as simple as a drop in attendance in the first weeks after a new

librarian takes over a storytime program. This does not mean that the program is a failure, only that it needs an initial adjustment period. If the lowered attendance persists, however, it is more likely that something inherent in the program itself (i.e., the titles chosen, the length, or the librarian's skill) is a problem unless something has changed in the target community (e.g., massive layoffs among parents, a gasoline crisis or transportation strike, ethnic/socioeconomic shifts, etc.) The latter would be another example of history. The threats cannot be examined in isolation from one another, and in this case they may be interacting.

The third threat is called *testing*. This occurs when the means of observation—whether an interview, a survey, or an attitudinal assessment such as the one mentioned earlier in connection with booktalks— influences the reaction of the program participants. If children are asked about whether they like to read, then a librarian comes to talk to them about books to read, and they are then asked again whether they like to read, the children may well deduce that they should say “yes” to this person. Thus the second responses will be unduly influenced by being asked the question previously, and the librarian will never know the real effect of booktalks on reading attitudes, or worse, assume a vastly inflated role in changing them. The best way to control for this threat is by using a similar group, also exposed to the before and after influence of the observation method but not to the program. It is also important that the comparison group of children not be able to interact with the ones experiencing the booktalks, or the distinction of the two groups is lost as a basis of comparison.

A threat related to testing is called *instrumentation*. This means the degree to which the method of observation is valid and reliable. Reliability is the extent to which the same measure gives the same results on repeated application. The influence of instrumentation is shown in national polls on public policy issues—such as abortion—where the answers vary depending on how the question is phrased. The key to reliability is whether the particular phrasing is similarly interpreted by all the people responding. This problem is possibly exacerbated with children because of their varying levels of cognitive development even among children of the same age. When the method of observation is a test or survey, it is extremely important to try it out on as many children as possible—excluding the actual audience to be surveyed or tested—to make sure that they interpret the question in the same way. For very young children, these methods of observation are not appropriate.

Validity is the extent to which a criterion really measures what it says it does. A measure can be reliable without necessarily being valid.

Evaluation of Children's Services

George D'Elia has pointed out, for example, that the output measures of materials availability, proposed by the Public Library Association, may really be measuring user behavior rather than materials availability and are invalid.²¹ From a children's services perspective, all of the first-level output measures are invalid because they do not take the age structure of the population into account. Not only do they ignore the proportion of children in the population but also the proportion of adults in the child rearing years who might be using the library for their children. At this point the PLA's output measures obscure children's services more than reveal them. The validity of these measures will probably be debated in professional literature for some time, and children's librarians would be wise not to let the debate go on without them.

One of the ways in which one controls for the threat of instrumentation, besides scrupulous pretesting with members of the intended audience, is by inviting outside experts and/or peers to comment on the validity of the measures chosen to document a particular activity. There are also statistical methods to assess validity and reliability. An excellent discussion of all the issues involved in good instrumentation appears in the chapter on data gathering in *Research for Decision-Making*²² as well as in Windsor's book, and in the titles cited in Moran's article. These methods are outside the scope of the present article.

Another threat is called *regression*. This refers to a statistical phenomenon whereby subjects chosen as an extreme example of any phenomenon will "regress" over time toward the average example of that phenomenon. Regression makes it impossible to tell whether the changed phenomenon was caused by the program or the types of people observed. The regression threat is related to another called *selection*. This refers to the group chosen for study and how representative they actually are of the entire population about whom the investigator might want to draw some conclusions. Selection also refers to characteristics of groups chosen for comparison with the group receiving the program. Selecting the wrong group of people in the first place, or the wrong group for comparison, can interfere with determining the impact of a program. The same references cited for an expanded study of instrumentation also include information on sampling and selection.

Even when the selection process has been sound, *attrition* can pose a threat. This refers to a significant loss of program participants and may give a clear signal that something is wrong with the program. Attrition can happen for a variety of reasons: the program was too long, the publicity was misleading, etc. Attrition, while dismaying, is very important, especially when those who drop out or leave a program

differ markedly from those who stay. A common mistake is to overlook these differences and ascribe success to the program because a reasonable number of people stayed with it, especially when an examination of differences might reveal that the program was least successful with those it most intended to reach. Summer reading club attrition by age and sex begs for such an analysis.

While all the threats to program effectiveness can be discussed separately, they tend to interact in real situations. A thorough understanding of the individual threats to a program provides the necessary insight not only to make programs more responsive in the first place but also to analyze in a systematic way the program's actual effects.

There is a third level of evaluation called *evaluation research* which is usually beyond the resources and training of practitioners, but the results of this level of research should be known to them. Evaluation research is the process by which the theories underlying practitioner programs are scientifically tested. Bodart tested the hypothesis that booktalks improved the reading attitudes of adolescents.²³ Smardo looked at the effect of different types of story hour presentations on the receptive language of children.²⁴ Powell et al. investigated the relationship between certain childhood experiences and adult library use.²⁵ Heyns studied summer activity that influenced children's vocabulary scores.²⁶ Greene compared three different types of library-based early childhood centers.²⁷ Fasick and England compared media preferences between childhood users and nonusers of a Canadian public library.²⁸

Unfortunately, most academic research related to children's services has focused on the contents of materials produced for children rather than the impact of library services on them. Benne indicated that measurement of children's services was a problem because of a lack of clearly defined goals,²⁹ and the author suspects that this problem carries over to the conceptualization of research. It is doubly important that the little research that has been done be familiar to practicing children's librarians so that they understand that their programs are based on sound theory rather than on tradition. Knowledge of evaluation research can enhance program justification and planning.

Politics of Evaluation

The fact that a program has clear measurable objectives, valid measures, and sufficient resources to document itself does not ensure a successful evaluation although all those factors must be present in order to do one. Evaluation serves more than one purpose within an organiza-

Evaluation of Children's Services

tion. Besides providing evidence for decision-making—and possibly proving accountability to the public—an evaluation should also gain administrative support for solving the problems it reveals. Thus the ultimate success of an evaluation depends on “the skill of the evaluators in understanding the value systems present in the organization.”³⁰ If the library does not have a capacity for self-criticism and change, an evaluation may only be an exercise in futility. Davis and Salasin have proposed eight factors to examine and consider before beginning an evaluation process:

Ability to undertake and use an evaluation in terms of monetary resources, available staff, and staff energy to mount both the study and for the implementation of resultant recommendations.

Values held in the organization. Specifically, is the organization secure in its environment, open in its decision-making structure, willing to change, and is management able to accept criticism and act on it?...

Information available or that can be procured to support the evaluation.

Circumstances prevailing at the time of the evaluation. Elements examined include recent changes in programs, new or old leadership, state of client relationships, internal conflict, openness in the exchange of ideas and criticism.

Timing of the evaluation should coincide with other activities or programs that might encourage change....

Obligation to change. If there is dissatisfaction with the status quo, changes can occur more easily and naturally.

Resistance to change is always present in the organization, and an understanding of its sources and strengths is critical for anyone evaluating the organization's programs.

Yield. From the outset, there must be assurances by management that it considers the evaluation to be important, that the results of the evaluation will justify its costs, and that it expects to use the results to bring about desired changes.³¹

While these factors are intended to enlighten an outsider who comes in to evaluate an organization, they are equally important for an insider to consider. Just as a children's librarian might feel attacked if suddenly asked to evaluate his or her program, a library director will feel just as attacked by a good evaluation of a children's program that demands change on the part of management. There are political ramifications to “describing oneself to others” through a program evaluation, and they are ignored at one's peril. In many cases it may be necessary to postpone reporting the evaluation results until a change in management precipitates a change in organizational values.

Evaluation Problems Unique to Children's Services

Organizational Isolation

Most children's librarians positions are entry-level, which usually means that there are several hierarchical layers of authority between children's librarians and top management. The resources and support necessary not only to do, but to respond to the results of a program evaluation can be waylaid at any of the levels. This is particularly true in libraries converting to automation. If the children's librarian evaluates the use of the catalog by children and presents children's needs for multiple, popular subject access points before the implementation of automation, he or she may be particularly unwelcome to a branch librarian or children's coordinator who has received a clear message from the top that funding will never cover that level of quality in the system.

Evaluation of Children's Services

Appendix A

Wolfsohn Memorial Library, Pennsylvania Toddler Story Hour Parent's Evaluation

We would appreciate your comments about this program in order to help evaluate its worth and to help determine whether it should be continued.

Time of day: Too early___ Too late___ OK___
Length:
(each program) Too short___ Too long___ OK___
Length: (series) Too short___ Too long___ OK___
Place: Too small___ Too many distractions___ OK___
Size of group: Too large___ OK___

Program and materials used:

Not enough planned___ To much planned___
Child not interested in stories___
Child not interested in activities___
Stories, activities too old for child___
Stories, activities too young for child___
Stories, activities OK___

Would you attend this program again?___
Why or why not?_____

Would you recommend this program to a friend or neighbor? Yes___ No___
Did you find this program helpful in selecting library materials for
your child? Yes___ No___

Since you both began participating in the program, have you noticed any
changes in your child:

Longer attention span Yes___ No___
Greater interest in looking at books Yes___ No___
Greater interest in listening to stories at
home Yes___ No___
Greater enjoyment and interest in coming to
the library Yes___ No___
Greater rapport with other children Yes___ No___
Greater rapport with adults outside the
family Yes___ No___

Do you have any comments you would like to add?_____

Source: C.Y.P.S.L.'s Idea Exchange Handbook, Pennsylvania Library
Association, 1981

Reprinted with permission of Wolfsohn Memorial Library.

MARY CHELTON

Appendix B

Virginia Beach Public Library Cable Storytime Feasibility Study (Publishers/Titles)

Abingdon Press	HUMBUG RABBIT
Atheneum Publishers Children's Press	MAY WE SLEEP HERE TONIGHT? BLUE BUG GOES TO THE LIBRARY BLUE BUG'S VEGETABLE GARDEN TIME TO RHYME WITH CALICO CAT
Curtis Brown, LTD	PUPPY TOO SMALL
Doubleday & Co., Inc.	8,000 STONES: A CHINESE FOLKTALE
E.P. Dutton, Inc.	ANDREW'S BATH PIG PIG GOES TO CAMP
Greenwillow Books Y Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Books	GOOD AS NEW ONE DUCK ANOTHER DUCK THE SURPRISE PEA SOUP & SEA SERPENTS THE GREAT BIG ESPECIALLY BEAUTIFUL EASTER EGG
Harper & Row	GIVING TREE MOTHER RABBIT'S SON TOM
Holiday House, Inc.	THE BIG BUNNY AND THE EASTER EGGS
Holt, Rinehart and Winston	BOO! WHO? LIANG AND THE MAGIC PAIN BRUCH
Houghton Mifflin Co.	YUMMERS
Little Brown & Co.	MARY ALICE, OPERATOR 9 ANDREW'S BATH
MacMillian Publishing Co., Inc.	TWO GREEDY BEARS ASK MR. BEAR MUSHROOMS IN THE RAIN
Pantheon Books	CORNELIUS SWIMMY THE BIGGEST HOUSE IN THE WORLD WINTER PICNIC
Prentice-Hall, Inc.	THE CATERPILLAR AND THE POLLIWOG LITTLE PEEP
The Putnam Publishing Group	SOPHIE AND JACK WHERE'S SPOT THE VERY HUNGRY CATERPILLAR THE LITTLE RABBIT WHO WANTED RED WINGS
Rae John Publishers	THE LITTLE RED HEN
Vanguard Press	THE MAGIC BOAT AND OTHER CHINESE FOLK STORIES
Western Publishing Co., Inc.	HOME FOR A BUNNY THE GOLDEN EGG BOOK
World Free Flight Press	THE VERY HUNGRY CATERPILLAR

Evaluation of Children's Services

Appendix C

**Center for Early Adolescence
Program Participant Questionnaire**

We are interested in knowing what you think about this program. Please take the time to answer these questions so we can make our program even better.

1. How old are you? _____
2. Are you ___male? ___female?
3. How often do you come to
this program? _____
4. What do you like about this program?

5. What do you not like about this program?

6. Is there an adult here whom you
talk to when you want advice or
just want to talk about personal
concerns and problems? ___yes ___no
7. Do you think this statement is
true or false? "Almost everyone
at this program has a close
relationship with at least one
adult staff member." ___true ___false
8. Do you think this is true or
false? "The adults at this
program really care about me." ___true ___false
9. What are the three most important rules here?

10. Do people frequently break the
rules here? ___yes ___no

Why is that?

What happens when they do?
11. Do you have a voice in making
decisions and planning activi-
ties here? ___yes ___no
12. Do you feel safe here? ___yes ___no

Explain.

13. Do you get to do something you
are good at here? ___yes ___no

If yes, what? If no, why not?

MARY CHELTON

14. Do you get to do things you like to do here? yes no
- If yes, name two things:
- If not, why not?
- What could be done to give you more opportunities to do the things you like?
14. What is the purpose of this program? What does it stand for?
16. What changes would you like to see at this program?

Is there a way you can help make these changes? yes no

If yes, how?

17. What do you think is the biggest problem young people your age have? Does this program help you and your friends deal with that problem? If yes, how? If no, why not? What could be done here to help you with that problem?
18. How do you get here after school, (for instance, by bus, bike, walking, carpool)? _____
- Is this convenient? yes no
19. Is there something else you would rather be doing after school? yes no
20. On days when you do not come to this program, what do you do? (Check all that you do.)
- a. take care of young brothers and sisters. yes no
 - b. participate in school activities (such as cheerleading clubs, and sports). yes no
 - c. receive tutoring yes no
 - d. participate in other organized groups or clubs yes no
 - e. do volunteer work (such as helping in a hospital, tutoring) yes no
 - f. do work for pay yes no
 - g. participate in non-school-sponsored team sports yes no
 - h. play outdoors in the neighborhood, at a sports field, or on a local playground yes no

Evaluation of Children's Services

- i. go to a shopping district
or mall yes no
- j. go to the library yes no
- k. visit a museum yes no
- i. go to church or synagogue
activities yes no
- m. hang around
(where? _____) yes no
- n. stay at home yes no
- o. visit a friend yes no
- p. other yes no

21. How did you learn about this program?

22. List some things you would like to do or learn about; for example, "tour a TV station" or "learn how to cook."

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.
- e.
- f.

23. What else would you like to tell us about how you feel about this program?

Reprinted with permission from the
Center for Early Adolescence
Suite 223
Carr Mill Mall
Carrboro, NC 27510

Appendix D

Youth Services Department, New Hanover County Public Library Program Evaluation Form

Scale: 2-poor 4-fair 6-average 8-very good 10-exceptional	Name Date Program	Comments
		1. Attitude toward children (cheerfulness, welcoming, comfortable)
		2. Attitude toward parents/teachers (approachable, comfortable, helpful)
		3. Preparation (familiar with all material)
		4. Theme (appropriate, used throughout prog.)
		5. Program flow (smooth, orderly, keeps children involved)
		6. Selection of material (app. to age and dev. level of children)
		7. Balance of formats (use of books, AV and activities)
		8. Presentation (voice, movement, body language)
		9. Use of activities (as stimulation or calming factor)
		10. Control (of children and adults)

Reprinted with permission of Youth Services Coordinator, New Hanover County Public Library, Wilmington, NC

Evaluation of Children's Services

References

1. American Library Association. Public Library Association. Subcommittee on Standards for Children's Services. *Standards for Children's Services in Public Libraries*. Chicago: ALA, 1964.
2. De Prosopo, Ernest, et al. *Performance Measures for Public Libraries*. Chicago: ALA, 1973.
3. New York Library Association. Youth Services Section. *Standards for Youth Services in Public Libraries of New York State*. New York: NYLA, 1984.
4. Zweizig, Douglas, et al. *Output Measures for Children's Services in Wisconsin Public Libraries: A Pilot Project-1984-85*. Madison: Wisconsin Division for Library Services, 1985.
5. Chelimsky, Eleanor. "Old Patterns and New Directions in Program Evaluation." In *Program Evaluation: Patterns and Directions*, edited by Eleanor Chelimsky. Washington, D.C.: ASPA, 1985.
6. Kewish, Nancy. "South Euclid's Pilot Project for Two-Year-Olds and Parents." *School Library Journal* 25(March 1979):93-98.
7. Wendling, Kathy. "Porter Makes the Cable Connection." *School Library Journal* 29(April 1983):19-22.
8. Crowley, Terence, and Childers, Thomas. *Information Service in Public Libraries: Two Studies*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1971; and Gers, Ralph, and Seward, Lillie J. "Improving Reference Performance: Results of a Statewide Study." *Library Journal* 110(Nov. 1985):32-35.
9. Robbins-Carter, Jane, and Zweizig, Douglas L. "Are We There Yet? Evaluating Library Collections, Reference Services, Programs, and Personnel." *American Libraries* 16-17(Oct. 1985-March 1986):624-27, 724-27, 780-84, 32-36.
10. Lynch, Mary Jo. "Measurement of Public Library Activity: The Search for Practical Methods." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 57(Jan. 1983):388-93.
11. Weiss, Carol H. *Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
12. Rayward, W. Boyd. "Programming in Public Libraries: Qualitative Evaluation." *Public Libraries* 24(Spring 1985):24-27.
13. Chelton, Mary K. "Developmentally Based Performance Measures for Young Adult Services." *Top of the News* 41(Fall 1984):39-51.
14. Windsor, Richard A., et al. *Evaluation of Health Promotion and Education Programs*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield, 1984.
15. Moran, Barbara B. "Survey Research for Librarians." *Southeastern Librarian* 35(Fall 1985):78-81.
16. Windsor, *Evaluation of Health Promotion and Education Programs*.
17. Hektoen, Faith. "The Connecticut Research Documentation Project." *School Library Journal* 26(April 1980):22-24; Norton, Diana, and Goodgion, Laurel. "Documenting Information Requests." *School Library Journal* 26(April 1980):27; and Hippenhammer, Craighton. "Measuring Children's Library Collections Through Objective Data." *Top of the News* 42(Spring 1986):309-13.
18. Thomas, James L., and Loring, Ruth M., eds. *Motivating Children and Young Adults to Read*. Phoenix, Ariz.: Oryx Press, 1983.
19. Bodart, Joni. *Booktalk*. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1980.
20. ———. *Booktalk 2*. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1985.
21. D'Elia, George. "Materials Availability Fill Rates—Useful Measures of Library Performance?" *Public Libraries* 24(Fall 1985):106-10.
22. Swisher, Robert, and McClure, Charles R. *Research for Decision-Making*. Chicago: ALA, 1980.
23. Bodart, Joni. "Book You!" *Voice of Youth Advocates* 9(April 1986):22-23.
24. Smardo, Frances. *What Research Tells Us About Storyhours and Receptive*

MARY CHELTON

Language. Dallas: Dallas Public Library and North Texas State University, 1982.

25. Powell, Ronald R., et al. "Childhood Socialization: Its Effect on Adult Library Use and Adult Reading." *Library Quarterly* 54(July 1984):245-64.

26. Heyns, Barbara. *Summer Learning and the Effects of Schooling*. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

27. Greene, Ellin. "Early Childhood Centers: Three Models." *School Library Journal* 30(Feb. 1984).

28. Fasick, Adele, and England, Claire. *Children Using Media. Reading and Viewing Preferences Among the Users and Non-Users of the Regina Public Library*. Saskatchewan: Regina Public Library, 1977.

29. Benne, Mae. "Educational and Recreational Services of the Public Library for Children." *Library Quarterly* 48(Oct. 1978):499-510.

30. Williams, Delmus E., and Racine, Drew. "Planning for Evaluation: The Concept of Pre-Evaluation." *LAMA Newsletter* 11(Sept. 1985):73-75.

31. Davis, Howard R., and Salasin, Susan E. "The Utilization of Evaluation" quoted in Williams, and Drew. "Planning for Evaluation," pp. 73-75.

32. Benne, Mae M. "Information Services in Central Children's Libraries." *School Library Journal* 26(April 1980):25.

33. Bouvier, Leon. *America's Baby Boom Generation: The Fateful Bulge (Population Bulletin 35:1)*. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, 1980.

34. U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Characteristics of the Population (Series P-20)*. Washington, D.C.: USGPO 1982.

35. DIALOG. DIALOG Information Services, Inc., 3460 Hillview Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

36. Donnelley Marketing Information Services. *Market Profile Analysis*. Stamford, Conn.: Donnelley Marketing Information Services.

37. Hewlett, Sylvia. *A Lesser Life: The Myth of Women's Liberation*. New York: Morrow, 1986.

38. Benne, "Information Services in Central Children's Libraries." p. 25.

39. Thornton, Arland, and Freedman, Deborah. *The Changing American Family (Population Bulletin 38:4)*. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, 1983; and Edmondson, Brad. "Education of Children." *American Demographics* 8(Feb. 1986):27-29, 51-52, 54.

40. Population Reference Bureau Staff. *U.S. Population: Where We Are; Where We're Going (Population Bulletin 37:2)*. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, 1982.

41. Willett, Holly. "Current Issues in Public Library Services for Children." *Public Libraries* 24(Winter 1985):137-40; Hennepin County Library. *Services to Children in Groups Task Force Report*. Ridgedale, Minn.: Hennepin County Library, 1985; and Denniston, Susan. "Extending Library Services to Children: Reaching Out to Preschools and Other Day Care Facilities." *Emergency Librarian* 13(Jan./Feb. 1986):19-20.

42. Children's Defense Fund, 122 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.