Public Libraries as a Context for the Study of Learning and Development

Michelle Taylor, Megan E. Pratt, Richard A. Fabes

Abstract

Public libraries are ideal contexts for supporting child development and family involvement (Families and Work Institute, 2015; IMLS, 2013). Families with children often attend public libraries to participate in educational programming and experiences, yet university-based developmental scientists who study how people develop and adapt across the lifespan have not fully recognized them as a significant context for the study of learning and development. This reflective essay suggests that developmental scientists and public libraries can achieve mutual benefits through joint research and evaluation efforts within the library context. We illustrate this type of collaboration through a firsthand account of a university-library partnership developed to support family engagement in library settings that promotes optimal parenting and enhances children's school readiness.

Keywords: public library, early learning, community partnership

(American Library Association, 2014). als (e.g., puppets, puzzles) that encourage Despite adapting to social, historical, and learning through play and hands-on extechnological changes over the decades, ploration. These changes are supported by their core value remains the same: to serve as a community anchor that meets the local needs of individuals across all ages and stages of life, including children. In the early 2000s, many were writing about the demise of public libraries (Bruccoli, 2007). Shrinking budgets and a fear of decreasing interest in reading paper-based materials took a huge toll on this long-standing community institution. However, since that time, public libraries have adapted their Despite the demonstrated value of public liservice model to address a wider range of braries to families with children, and a focus community needs. This expansion includes on providing educational programming and offering more experiences that encourage experiences, there remains great untapped knowledge and skill building, often in the potential for university-based developmenform of programming (Wiegand, 2015). For tal scientists who study how people develop example, in 2012, there were 92.6 million and adapt across the lifespan to recognize attendees at the 4 million programs offered and engage with libraries as a significant by U.S. public libraries (Swan et al., 2014). context for the study of learning and devel-This represents an increase of 37.6% in at- opment. Reflecting on our own experience tendance from 2004. Programs for families developing a university-library partnership,

oday's public libraries are built with children include storytimes, school on a long history of providing readiness classes, hands-on activities free, equitable, and equal access (e.g., makerspaces, robotics), and parentto information for all people ing classes; libraries also provide enriching in the communities they serve children's spaces with books and materiefforts from the American Library Association (ALA) campaign titled Libraries Transform designed to increase public awareness of the value, impact, and services provided by libraries. This campaign's key message states, "Libraries today are less about what they have for people and more about what they do for and with people" (ALA, 2016, "Key Messages").

developmental scientists and public libraries have a major negative impact on them and can produce mutual benefits through joint their family (Horrigan, 2015). Libraries research and evaluation efforts within the appear even more valued by patrons who library context. On the one hand, librar- identify as racial/ethnic minorities, female, ies can benefit by strategically developing parents of minor children, or low income and refining library-based programming (Horrigan, 2015). Moreover, libraries can that effectively promotes the well-being of play a significant role in fostering literacy, families with children. On the other hand, particularly among those segments of the developmental scientists can benefit by broadening their understanding of learning developing literacy skills, such as young and other developmental processes within children (Celano & Neuman, 2001). ecologically valid, informal learning settings that reach a broad segment of the population. In this reflective essay we will (a) viding children with a rich set of literacydiscuss how the expanding and changing focused experiences. In step with increased role of the public library in the 21st century positions it well for partnership with development, which highlights the need for developmental scientists; (b) highlight the experiences that support the whole child intersecting goals of developmental sci- (i.e., all domains of development are interentists and public libraries that support related; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000), public engaged scholarship; and (c) provide an libraries are also increasingly offering example of a university-public library programming that targets developmental partnership conducting community-based domains beyond literacy (IMLS, 2013). For research focused on improving the lives of example, some libraries are offering exfamilies with young children.

Changing Role of Public Libraries in the 21st Century

Public libraries adapt and evolve according to the changing needs of their communities. This has been reflected in recent years by a shift from serving primarily as book-lending institutions to institutions that provide varied and innovative learning experiences, including programming targeting families with children (Gouzie, 2013; IMLS, 2013; Naidoo, 2014). Indeed, in recent years libraries have been increasingly recognized as ideal contexts for supporting the development of children (young children, youth, and teens) and family involvement (Families and Work plicitly explaining the important features to Institute, 2015; IMLS, 2013).

nity anchors, public libraries exist within Institute, 2015). nearly every U.S. community. For example, 17,219 library branches reach approxi- Indeed, creating and providing high quality, mately 96.4% of the population (Swan et developmentally appropriate experiences for al., 2014), and over 90% of Americans age families with children in informal commu-16 and older report visiting a public library nity-based settings, like public libraries, at some point in their lives (Zickuhr, Rainie, which are distinct from other traditional & Purcell, 2013). There is also agreement learning contexts (e.g., home, school), is within communities that libraries are im- a challenging task. Increased recognition portant; according to a recent survey, 65% of the value of these community spaces as of U.S. citizens 16 and older say that closing welcoming learning environments has led to their library would have a major negative increased attention from funding agencies, impact on their community, and about one educators, policy makers, and developmen-

we argue that greater collaboration between third say that closing their library would population that need special assistance in

Public libraries have a long history of proawareness of the science of early childhood periences that encourage learning across many developmental domains, including social-emotional (e.g., self-regulation activities), physical (e.g., music and movement activities), and cognitive (e.g., scienceand math-focused activities). However, although libraries are providing more stimulating materials and experiences that support children's learning and development (e.g., books, videos, technology, programs), research suggests that currently many of these efforts are subtle and thus not always effectively communicating to parents and caregivers the process of learning. For example, librarians often model literacy skills for parents during storytimes and provide learning materials and activities to support learning without exparents, describing why particular practices matter, or helping families develop skills With a long history of serving as commu- they can use at home (Families and Work

Taken together, public libraries' openness to adjusting service delivery to meet the needs of their communities, alongside a growing awareness of the need to under- Once successful partnerships are created, stand and capitalize on experiences within they provide a strong foundation and mothese informal learning settings, means tivation for engaging in community-based that great potential exists for collaborative research (CBR) projects. CBR provides a efforts between developmental scientists useful framework for collaboration between and public libraries focused on improving developmental scientists and public librarcommunity-based supports for families ies, in which mutual benefits can result with children.

Capitalizing on Shared Goals

Building from a shared view of supporting life-long learning and a desire to improve human lives, developmental scientists and public libraries are well positioned to develop productive university-community partnerships that support effective library experiences for families. In addition to strengthening the effectiveness of librarybased experiences for communities, such partnerships can also provide space for developmental scientists to move the field forward in terms of increasing understanding of how the processes that take place within relatively understudied ecological settings result in positive outcomes (Bornstein, 2015; Overton, 2015; Vandell, Larson, Mahoney, & Watts, 2015). Another commonality between the goals of library institutions and developmental scientists is a shared focus on promoting well-being across many stages of the lifespan, ranging from infancy to late adulthood. Both fields also recognize the importance of intergenerational experiences in families and communities, and share a focus on the need to address issues of equity, particularly in terms of learning how to promote thriving for all individuals in a given community.

Successful university-community partnerships are developed over time (Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, & Morrison, 2010) building to come up with innovative ways and characterized by trusting relationships of solving real-world problems. Finally, CBR (Christopher, Watts, McCormick, & Young, addresses community needs and reflects a 2008), open dialogue (Weerts, 2005), and commitment to social change (Strand et al.,

tal scientists, who see the great untapped mutual goals that directly benefit the compotential of these spaces for promoting munity (Fear, Creamer, Pirog, Block, & and understanding development in context Redmond, 2004). Rather than hastily join– (Bell, Lewenstein, Shouse, & Feder, 2009; ing forces once funding has been awarded Schauble, Leinhardt, & Martin, 1997). Thus, for a project, truly transformational partthere is great potential for developmen- nerships include community partners from tal scientists and public libraries to work the beginning and view them as key decitogether to bring about more explicit and sion makers and contributors through every intentional strategies to effectively support step of the process. Although developing learning and development in these settings. this type of partnership takes considerable time, it ensures a balance of power among all parties, providing the opportunity for all voices to be heard (Clayton et al., 2010).

> from research and evaluation performed with the shared goal of improving the lives of families with children. According to Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, and Donohue (2003), "CBR is collaborative, change-oriented research that engages faculty members, students, and community members in projects that address a community-identified need" (p. 5). CBR can be understood in terms of three critical elements (Strand, 2000; Strand et al., 2003). First, CBR projects are collaborative. Similar to the relationship building necessary for maintaining university-community partnerships, CBR requires the joint investment and mutual effort of academics and community stakeholders. This collaboration should start early, ensuring community partners are involved in every step of the research process. Academics often bring content knowledge, research experience, and university resources, and community partners also have unique expertise. The focus of CBR should stem from this community expertise and aim to solve a "real world problem" identified by the community (Strand et al., 2003). Second, CBR recognizes and values the unique knowledge partners bring to the work, putting equal emphasis on the content-specific knowledge of faculty and the local experiential knowledge of community partners (Strand et al., 2003). In doing so, all partners are able to stretch their current understandings through a process of joint discovery and knowledge

multitude of purposes, including improving skills related to future educational and deprogramming, identifying problems, and velopmental goals (Association of Scienceaddressing needs. New discoveries can be Technology Centers, 2014; Ito et al., 2013). used to make plans, refine practices, and implement new ways of doing. This requires In addition to helping to build library-based the identification of long-term goals and experiences from the ground up, there is engaging in a dynamic process of reflection also room for developmental scientists to and refinement over time.

In this reflective essay, we argue that the development of successful developmental scientist-public library partnerships creates an ideal context for this type of work. We have identified two areas of concern that are particularly suited for this type of collaboration: (a) efforts toward creating and improving programming in public libraries to understand what works in library needed to engage in systematic refinement contexts for promoting family involvement and supporting child development and (b) addressing issues of equity and inclusion in public libraries for diverse families with children.

Providing Effective Programming

One promising area for collaboration between developmental scientists and public libraries is improving the effectiveness of An example of improving existing library library-based learning experiences. One programming is the Every Child Ready to example of such a collaboration is *Learning* Read (ECRR) program, which builds on Labs, a national network of innovative traditional storytime classes, a cornerspaces across 24 libraries and museums. In stone of early childhood library programresponse to a 2010 presidential initiative to ming. The development and evaluation make STEM education a national priority, of the ECRR program is a joint venture a public-private partnership between the undertaken by the Association for Library Institute of Museum and Library Services Service to Children (ALSC) and the Public (IMLS) and the John D. and Catherine T. Library Association (PLA) in collaboration MacArthur Foundation supported the cre- with early childhood literacy experts in the ation of Learning Labs. Learning Labs are developmental science field. Traditional spaces where adolescents, with assistance public library storytime programs are typifrom knowledgeable mentors (such as com- cally directed exclusively to children (e.g., munity experts), can interact with peers a librarian reading a book to a group of to engage with a variety of digital media children sitting on a carpeted area). Library and other tools (Association of Science- professionals and developmental scientists Technology Centers, 2014). The design of recognized the need to improve upon this these spaces was heavily influenced by existing model to further enhance the ethnographic research conducted by Ito et parent and caregiver learning potential by al. (2009), who observed that when ado- more explicitly addressing the adults in the lescents were engaging in interest-driven room. Specifically, the ECRR program inonline learning, they were thinking and volves training library professionals to lead experimenting in new and innovative ways enhanced storytime sessions that involve the (e.g., experimenting with their roles) com- participation of both parents and children. pared to behavior seen in product-driven In these sessions, parents are led through learning (e.g., required assignments, graded early-literacy activities with their children work). Informed by this research evidence, while being taught how to apply and expand Learning Labs were intentionally designed on these learning strategies in their daily to promote connected learning, or learning interactions with children once at home. A that builds on an individual's socially rel- notable strength of the ECRR program is its

2003). Results of CBR projects may serve a evant interests to develop knowledge and

support the refinement of existing programs developed by library professionals. Public libraries are unique in their capacity to create individual programs tailored to local constituent needs. This has led to a variety of locally created library programs that widely differ by community. Developmental scientists offer expertise to assist with evaluating programming efforts to effectively gather and analyze the data of programs to ensure they are effectively benefiting families. Moreover, funders increasingly require evidence of programming effectiveness. Thus, by supporting developmental scientists in collecting, analyzing, and translating research-based evidence, libraries increase their capacity to secure funding from outside agencies and foundations.

strong foundation in high-quality research. store, museum, zoo, or theater (National childhood experiences in the development searches, and interactive learning opportuin developing early literacy skills (National the lives of families who need them most, science experts, to inform each of the ECRR counterbalance inequalities in learning exprogram components. The ECRR program periences prevalent among low-income and draws heavily on high-quality research to otherwise underrepresented populations; of early experiences are most important to their children's literacy development, as well as provide families with the tools they need to actively promote these skills outside the storytime room. In sum, ECRR is a strong example of how developmental scientists and public libraries can work together to enhance existing library-based programming.

Providing Equitable Opportunities

Public libraries provide affordable and accessible spaces and services for all community members. Indeed, the ALA (2015) states that—regardless of age, education, ethnicity, language, income, physical limitations, or geographic barriers—libraries must ensure that all citizens can access the information they need. However, libraries struggle to provide equal collections, programs, and services for diverse patrons (Naidoo, 2014). At a national level, for example, it appears that low-income and racial/ethnic minority families are less likely to view libraries as community anchors and White, educated women are more likely to use library services than any other population (Horrigan, 2016). This suggests that libraries must work not only to develop inclusive programming that meets the needs of diverse families and encourages repeated visits, but also toward getting families in the door.

Despite overall lower usage of library deterred families from using their local liservices among some populations, under- brary. In addition, recognizing that travel to represented families who do visit libraries library locations is often a challenge, SPELL view public libraries as important institu- recommends public libraries deliver library tions. For example, families living in pov- services beyond the walls of library spaces erty are more likely to visit a library than by partnering with organizations that alother community spaces, such as a book- ready work with vulnerable families (e.g.,

In 2000, the National Institute of Child Center for Education Statistics, 2015). In Health and Human Development (NICHD), addition, low-income families tend to use one of the most prolific and rigorous en- libraries for different reasons than their tities of child research, published a report wealthier counterparts: They are more likely that provided a comprehensive synthesis of than advantaged families to report using findings regarding the importance of early the library for services such as training, job of literacy and empirically driven recom- nities (Celano & Neuman, 2015). Although mendations for how best to support children public libraries play an important role in Reading Panel & NICHD, 2000). ECRR de- there is still a need for increased efforts velopers partnered with the NICHD, as well to engage families and remove barriers to as individual early literacy developmental accessing library resources and services to teach parents and caregivers what types this is another area where developmental scientist-public library collaboration would be fruitful.

> Recent research has addressed how to better connect and engage diverse families with public libraries. For example, Sirinides, Fink, and DuBois (2016) investigated the availability and accessibility of early learning opportunities in libraries in underresourced neighborhoods in Philadelphia. Study results highlighted perceived family barriers to attending libraries, such as a view of branch libraries as more out-ofdate compared to further-away central libraries, concerns about staff's ability to work with children, and hours of operation that conflict with working-parent schedules (i.e., closed in the evenings). Further, current developmental scientist-public library partnership efforts appear to be effective in overcoming barriers to find ways to engage diverse families with library services. For example, the Colorado State Library Project, Supporting Parents in Early Literacy through Libraries (SPELL), used research to develop solutions for engaging low-income families in early literacy programs (Colorado State Library, 2015). After engaging in an extensive environmental scan to identify public library programs and practices that successfully engage hard-to-reach, lowincome families, the SPELL project created a set of recommendations for public library practitioners, such as ending overdue fines for board books and picture books that

neighborhood centers, Title I schools).

Developmental scientists can also support the public library workforce by increasing their child development and family processes knowledge and skills. A skilled library workforce is integral to the success of libraries to support families with children. Recent service model shifts have resulted in staff being increasingly called upon to facilitate learning opportunities. Consequently, the workforce needs greater support to skillfully facilitate the library experience (Gonzalez, 2010). Indeed, the ALA (2009) found that among libraries naenough staff to help patrons, and roughly partnership between university develto this complexity is the fact that libraries readiness. The early learning coordinaserve individuals across the full life span, tor at the public library reached out to the each with unique developmental needs and local university for guidance after receivinterests. We believe that developmental ing feedback from funders that all future scientists can play an important role in investments were to be allocated to evisupporting library staff's interactions with dence-based programming. The library was diverse families with children by imple- looking for feedback and guidance regardmenting, improving, and creating high- ing the quality of their programming and quality professional development focused what it means to become "evidence-based." appropriate practices.

Through various strategies addressed above, supporting the participation of diverse families in public libraries not only holds great potential to achieve public library goals, but stands to benefit developmental scientists as well. For example, there is great concern regarding the growing income-achievement gap and a desire to create feasible solutions to this problem. Public libraries are ideal settings to understand inequities in access library staff brought knowledge of the local to learning experiences at the community community and its needs, grant-writing level and to test novel solutions to such experience and skills, and language and problems, which may be generalizable to literacy content knowledge. Developmental other informal community institutions. scientists, along with several graduate stu-Moreover, developmental scientist-public dents, spent considerable time in the library library collaborations are well suited to observing programming, learning about advancing the field of child development, the supports and resources public libraries particularly addressing an important me- provide to the community, and gaining an sosystem, the intersection of home and understanding of the many roles of library community settings for diverse families. staff. During meetings, developmental By engaging in research at the library, de- scientists and library staff spoke about provelopmental scientists can gain insight into gram effectiveness and discussed strategies community-based strengths, identify bar- for understanding whether library programs riers to engagement, and test new ways to are achieving their intended goals for famisupport all families in a given community. lies with children. Shared goals were quickly For example, a library may test offering its defined. The library had already identi-

programming at a popular local community center located in a largely Latino neighborhood, adding more Saturday and later afternoon classes, or changing policies so that low-income families do not have to pay late fines, which may be perceived as a barrier.

The Partnership for Family–Library **Engagement: A Case Study**

Developing a University-Community Partnership

The Partnership for Family-Library tionally, nearly 60% reported not having Engagement is a university-community 50% reported their staff lacks the necessary opmental scientists and public library skills to meet patron demand. This may be professionals at Scottsdale Public Library due, in part, to the uniquely interdisciplin- aimed at supporting family engagement ary nature of librarianship that requires a in library settings that promotes optimal wide range of skills and expertise. Adding parenting and enhances children's school on culturally sensitive and developmentally Over the course of a year, developmental scientists and library professionals built a strong partnership based upon mutually shared interests and clearly defined goals. Relationships were built and trust was established through a series of meetings where partners got to know one another and the individual interests and expertise that each possessed. Developmental scientists brought the infrastructure and resources from the university, research knowledge and skills, and educational expertise. The

within context, possessed a common desire preliminary evidence of program effectiveing and development.

Providing Effective Programming Through CBR

eral enhanced storytime programs designed examine the efficacy of a public library enchildren's emerging social-emotional, diverse low-income families with children. cognitive, and language/literacy skills. This work has begun to explore the qualidevelopmental scientists and public library public library context and how they are reof change, connecting key program com- to family and child well-being in underponents and processes to measurable served populations. These efforts are also documenting evidence of program effec- partnership has successfully accomplished. tiveness.

Working collaboratively, partnership mem- benefited from gaining a better underbers developed an internal library grant standing of the needs and assets of library proposal to collect pilot data from fami- professionals and the communities they lies pre- and post-program participation serve. For example, we have also improved using survey methodology. Collecting de- our understanding of what effective protailed personal information from families gramming involves within public libraries, was a new endeavor for the library staff, which differ from home or formal preschool and because of the unique nature of public settings. Public libraries offer developmenlibraries as open, accessible, nonthreat- tal scientists the opportunity to apply their ening community spaces, this task was expertise and skills to a broader range of undertaken with extreme caution and sen- authentic practical problems and everyday sitivity. A developmental scientist and the settings that expand our theories, assumppublic library early learning coordinator tions, and methods. Specifically, public attended each program session, where they libraries vary from traditional educational introduced the partnership and its shared settings in that attendance is fluid (i.e., goals and clearly explained the purpose of public libraries are open accessible comthe research study. Families were invited to munity spaces), children represent various

fied a community need, providing quality participate and could easily opt out without early-learning experiences for families with any pressure or stigma. Over the course of a children ages 0–5 years, and was looking single program year, data was collected on for support with improving upon their ex- 276 families across six community locations isting efforts. The developmental scientists, (five public libraries, one neighborhood who study how children learn and develop center). Findings from these efforts provide to provide families access to community- ness. Specifically, public library enhanced based programs and experiences that would storytime programming was associated support parents as their child's first and with positive change in parent knowledge, best teachers and enhance children's learn- beliefs, and reported behavior (Taylor, Pratt, van Huisstede, & Gaias, 2016).

Building on this positive momentum, the partnership began working to secure funding for further research and evaluation Over the past 5 years, the Partnership for efforts. This includes a currently in-prog-Family-Library Engagement has worked ress 3-year randomized control trial funded collaboratively to refine and evaluate sev- by the Brady Education Foundation to to provide parent education and support hanced storytime program on linguistically Program improvement efforts began with ties of parent-child interactions within the professionals working closely together lated to parenting and child outcomes. This to clearly define the desired outcomes of type of research is critical for understanding enhanced storytime programming. Once how developmental and family processes program goals were identified, a theory within informal learning settings contribute outcomes, was created. Next, in an itera- important because library funding is highly tive process, this theory of change guided variable across communities, with much refinement of existing program compo- funding for programming dependent upon nents and practices to achieve the desired small grants and foundation support that outcomes. Once all parties were confident require programs to demonstrate evidence the programming was high quality (i.e., of effectiveness (Weigand, 2015). Partnering based on research, using best practices, and with developmental scientists can increase aligned with clear measurable outcomes), public libraries' capacity and potential for partnership members were ready to begin securing future funding, something our

Moreover, as university partners, we have

ages and stages (e.g., families often have learning standards into their instruction; multiple children), and parent participa- Taylor, 2017). In response to these findings, family processes within informal learning on increasing the cultural competence of libeing over time and across contexts (e.g., systems. Haden et al., 2014).

Providing Equitable Opportunities

Working together, the partnership has benefited from better understanding how public library programs operate by engaging in a systematic process of aligning program goals with measurable outcomes that impact the local community. This program refinement and evidence-building work has been particularly valuable to library programming efforts aimed at increasing diversity and inclusion. For example, findings from the preliminary evaluation revealed that families who participate in programming tend to be regular library users with little financial hardship (Taylor, Pratt, van Huisstede, & Gaias, 2016). This data has been integral for understanding whom the library is already reaching and provides support for additional efforts aimed at engaging underserved and hard-to-reach families, a new goal of our ongoing partnership.

study of library youth staff's perceptions process, as well as learn from it to further of programming for families with children. the field of child development and family Findings revealed that because of new studies. We encourage a "call to action" for enhanced storytime programming, many developmental scientists to partner with library youth staff are viewing themselves public libraries to support the new expeas educators for the first time and would riential types of learning occurring within like increased support for interacting with libraries and engage in practices to effecdiverse families and supporting child de- tively promote engaged scholarship and fuel velopment (e.g., incorporating state early an excitement for learning.

tion is often required in some capacity. This the partnership developed an interactive type of research in public libraries is critical enhanced storytime training for staff and for understanding how developmental and provided professional development focused settings contribute to family and child well- brary youth staff across several local library

Conclusion

Families tend to view libraries as part of their educational systems, as resources that promote literacy and school readiness, and as pathways to economic opportunity and community activism (Horrigan, 2015). Indeed, the majority of families that have ever used the public library view their experiences favorably (Zickuhr et al., 2013). We contend that, considering the positive view and accessibility of libraries across the United States, developmental scientist involvement is critical for libraries to realize their full potential as promoters of child development and family engagement. With the changing times, public libraries are developing ways to shift their service models to engage families with children by providing programming and experiences beyond traditional book lending. Considering that developmental science and public library fields share common goals, developmental In addition, we also recently completed a scientists are well positioned to support this

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the partnership between Arizona State University and Scottsdale Public Library that has led to advancements in applied developmental research and public library programming, and which continues to influence their work today. We would also like to thank Holly Henley, Arizona State Librarian, for her contributions and support in this work. Support for this paper comes in part from the T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family Dynamics at Arizona State University, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, a division of the Secretary of State, with federal funds from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, and Brady Education Foundation.

About the Authors

Michelle Taylor is an assistant professor of child development at California State University, Long Beach. Her primary research interests include examining contextual and relational influences on young children's learning and development. She received her Ph.D. in educational psychology from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Megan Pratt is an assistant professor of practice at Oregon State University. Her research examines how early learning in both formal (e.g., child care) and informal, community settings (e.g., libraries) supports families with young children. She received a Ph.D. in human development and family sciences from Oregon State University.

Richard Fabes is the John O. Whiteman Dean's Distinguished Professor and school director in the T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family Dynamics at Arizona State University. His research interests include children's adjustment to school, peer relationships, emotional development, and gender and adjustment. His Ph.D. is from Oklahoma State University.

References

- American Library Association. (2009). Planning for 2015: The recent history and future supply of librarians. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/tools/sites/ala.org.tools/files/content/ librarystaffstats/recruitment/Librarians_supply_demog_analys.pdf
- American Library Association. (2014). *Library bill of rights*. Retrieved from http://www. ala.org/advocacy/sites/ala.org.advocacy/files/content/LBORwithInterpretations.pdf
- American Library Association. (2015). *Strategic directions*. Retrieved from http://www. ala.org/aboutala/sites/ala.org.aboutala/files/content/governance/StrategicPlan/ Strategic%20Directions%20June%2028%202015.pdf
- American Library Association. (2016). *Libraries Transform Campaign*. Retrieved from http://www.ilovelibraries.org/librariestransform/about
- Association of Science-Technology Centers. (2014). Learning labs in libraries and museums: Transformative spaces for teens. Retrieved from https://www.imls.gov/assets/1/ AssetManager/LearningLabsReport.pdf
- Bell, P., Lewenstein, B., Shouse, A. W., & Feder, M. A. (Eds.). (2009). Learning science in informal environments: People, places, and pursuits. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Bornstein, M. M. (2015). Children's parent. In M. H. Bornstein & T. Leventhal (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Vol. 4. Ecological settings and processes (7th ed., pp. 55–132). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Bruccoli, M. J. (2007). The end of books and the death of libraries. *Against the Grain*, 19(1), Article 31. doi:https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5252
- Celano, D., & Neuman, S. B. (2001). The role of public libraries in children's literacy development. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.611.4915&rep=rep1&type=pdf
- Celano, D., & Neuman, S. B. (2015). Libraries emerging as leaders in parent engagement. Phi Delta Kappan, 96(7), 30-35.
- Christopher, S., Watts, V., McCormick, A., & Young, S. (2008). Building and maintaining trust in a community-based participatory research partnership. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(8), 1398–1406. doi:10.2105/ AJPH.2007.125757
- Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., Senor, B., Huq, J., & Morrison, M. (2010). Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(2), 5–21. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2027/sp0.3239521.0016.201
- Colorado State Library. (2015). SPELL: Supporting Parents in Early Literacy Through Libraries. Retrieved from http://spellproject.weebly.com/
- Families and Work Institute. (2015). Brain-building powerhouses: How museums and libraries can strengthen executive function life skills. Institute of Museum and Library Services. Retrieved from http://www.mindinthemaking.org/download/museumsand-libraries.pdf
- Fear, F., Creamer, N., Pirog, R., Block, D., & Redmond, L. (with Dickerson, M., Baldwin, S., & Imig, G.). (2004). Higher education–community partnerships: The politics of engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 9(2), 139–156. Retrieved from http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/index
- Gonzalez, M. E. (2010). Workforce competencies: Focus on urban public libraries. *Library Trends*, 59(1), 269–287.
- Gouzie, D. (2013). Family Place Libraries. *Maine Policy Review*, 22(1), 91. https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol22/iss1/21
- Haden, C. A., Jant, E. A., Hoffman, P. C., Marcus, M., Geddes, J. R., & Gaskins, S. (2014). Supporting family conversations and children's STEM learning in a children's museum. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 29(3), 333–344.
- Horrigan, J. (2015). Libraries at the crossroads. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved from https://www.pewinternet.org/2015/09/15/libraries-at-the-crossroads/

- Horrigan, J. B. (2016). *Libraries* 2016. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://www. pewinternet.org/2016/09/09/libraries-2016/
- Institute of Museum and Library Services. (2013). Growing young minds: How libraries and museums create lifelong learners. Retrieved from https://www.imls.gov/assets/1/ AssetManager/GrowingYoungMinds.pdf
- Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., Cody, R., Stephenson, B. H., Horst, H. A., . . . Perkel, D. (2009). Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out: Kids living and learning with new media. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Naidoo, J. C. (2014). The importance of diversity in library programs and material collections for children. Chicago, IL: Association for Library Service to Children, American Library Association.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Parent and family involvement in education, from the National Household Education Surveys Program of 2012. Retrieved from http:// nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013028rev
- National Reading Panel & National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.
- Overton, W. F. (2015). Process and relational developmental systems. In W. F. Overton & P. C. M. Molenaar (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Vol.* 1. Theory and method (7th ed., pp. 9–62). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Schauble, L., Leinhardt, G., & Martin, L. (1997). A framework for organizing a cumulative research agenda in informal learning contexts. *Journal of Museum Education*, 22(2&3), 3–8.
- Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). Neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development. Washington DC: National Academies Press.
- Sirinides, P., Fink, R., & DuBois, T. (2016). A study of early learning services in museums and libraries. Early Childhood Education Journal, 45(4), 563–573. doi:10.1007/s10643– 016-0820-z
- Strand, K. J. (2000). Community-based research as pedagogy. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7(1), 85–96. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2027/ sp0.3239521.0007.110
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). Principles of best practice for community-based research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(3), 5–15. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2027/sp0.3239521.0009.301
- Swan, D. W., Grimes, J., Owens, T., Miller, K., Arroyo, J., Craig, T., Dorinski, S., Freeman M., Isaac, N., O'Shea, P., Padgett, R., & Schilling, P. (2014). Public Libraries in the United States Survey: Fiscal Year 2012 (IMLS-2015-PLS-01). Institute of Museum and Library Services. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://www.imls.gov/sites/default/files/ legacy/assets/1/AssetManager/PLS_FY2012.pdf
- Taylor, M. (2017). Cultivating Knowing and Growing: An Extension of Measuring for Success. The LINK Enterprise, T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family Dynamics, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.
- Taylor, M., Pratt, M. E., van Huisstede, L., & Gaias, L. (2016). Measuring for Success: An Evaluation Report. The LINK Enterprise, T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family Dynamics, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

Vandell, D. L., Larson, R. W., Mahoney, J. L., & Watts, T. W. (2015). Children's organized

activities. In M. H. Bornstein & T. Leventhal (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Vol. 4. Ecological settings and processes (7th ed., pp. 305–344). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Weerts, D. J. (2005). Facilitating knowledge flow in community–university partnerships. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 10(3), 23–38. Retrieved from http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/index
- Wiegand, W. A. (2015). Part of our lives: A people's history of the American public library. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Zickuhr, K., Rainie, L., & Purcell, K. (2013). *Library services in the digital age.* Washington, DC: Pew Internet. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED539071.pdf