**Introduction**

**MAE GRAHAM**

There was a time when it was fashionable to present to a young woman on her eighteenth birthday a china or copper plate on which was hand painted or etched the following couplet:

Standing with reluctant feet
Where the brook and river meet.

It is the opinion of the editor of this issue of *Library Trends* that school libraries have now reached this enviable transition stage. There are healthy signs. A marriage has been arranged, represented by the 1969 *Standards for School Media Programs* prepared jointly by the American Association of School Librarians (ALA) and the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction (NEA). Traditionally, marriages of convenience are arranged for purposes of consolidating and thereby increasing wealth, influence, and prestige and to produce a stronger dynasty. The unified approach to instructional materials and services which is the basic philosophy of the 1969 *Standards* should accomplish all of these aims. While it may be called a marriage of convenience, it was in no sense a shotgun wedding. Each party is proud of its heritage and the contributions it has already made to American education. In addition, there is a long history of each party's recognition of the merits and contributions of the other.

The 1945 national standards, *School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow*, said, "In addition to books, challenging new materials are becoming an important part of library resources. . . . Librarians should take the initiative in making these aids known and often in securing and promoting their use. Where the services of a director of audio-visual education . . . [are] available the librarian will work closely with [him] in order that the whole materials program may be maintained." ¹

¹ Mae Graham is Assistant Director Division of Library Extension, Maryland State Department of Education.
In tracing the emerging concept of the instructional materials center, Brown and Norberg go even further back and report that "early moves toward integrated instructional-materials services came in widely separated school systems: Portland, Oregon, 1941; the state of Virginia, 1941; Rochester, New York, 1941; the state of Washington, 1947." 2 Newark, New Jersey, is another example. They quote both the AASL official position on School Libraries as Instructional Materials Centers 3 (1956) and the DAVI statement, The Function of Media in the Public Schools 4 (1963) and conclude: "numerous signs now point to a speed-up in the development of a single-school instructional-materials center. This new service is characterized by providing in one organization the services that students and teachers formerly associated with separate library, audio-visual, textbook depository, duplicating, photo lab, language lab, listening lab, programmed learning lab, and similar facilities." 5 This succinctly sums up the philosophy of the 1969 Standards and the changing nature of the school library. Those who are too timid or inflexible to accept the reality of this "one organization" that provides instructional materials and services or who cannot contemplate with equanimity a different generic name, should be reminded that media programs call for the talents, understanding, knowledge and skills of a multiplicity of persons including school librarians, audio-visual specialists, resource teachers, professional technologists, subject specialists, graphic artists and a variety of technicians. It should also be called to their attention that many national professional associations have indicated their approval of the "one organization" concept.

The authors of the following articles are persons who believe in the philosophy of the new standards and have shown no reluctance in leaving the quiet of the brook for the turbulence of the river. They accept the fact that the school library is in transition; they see it at a stage of development which provides both the audio-visual and school library professions the opportunities to realize their full potentials. It will be noted, too, that they often use terms interchangeably, with no sense of alarm. Two of the authors and the editor were members of the joint standards committee: Dr. Kelley, Miss Rice, and Miss Graham. Miss Crawford’s school is the recipient of a Knapp school library award and of ESEA planning and operational grants for the development of a library-located instructional resource center. Mrs. Grazier, an experienced school librarian, is now a member of a graduate library school faculty which not only is deeply interested in realistic programs
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for the education of school librarians, but is not afraid to experiment. Mr. Johnson is an authority on school architecture and was an early proponent of school library quarters designed to meet the needs of what is now the school media center. Mr. Cory is well-known for his efforts to extend library services in all areas and to all people and for his imaginative approaches to administration and services. His concluding essay in this issue reflects a keen recognition of the changes and trends discussed by the other authors. He has designed a structure which is provocative and positive and charted a course worthy of careful exploration.

Dr. Bowie and Mr. Naeny, each well-known in his respective field, were asked to write their articles because of the editor’s belief that continued emphasis must be placed on the context in which the school library or media center exists and also on her assumption that the changing nature of the school library is being brought about by the changing nature of the school. Dr. Bowie’s perceptive article points out the needs of society for the kind of person who values himself and others, who has an appreciation for diversity in thoughts and actions and who knows how to use conflict constructively. She discusses the fallacies in thinking of intelligence as a fixed phenomena and of the reliance on group IQ testing. She stresses the need for drastic changes in educational programs, for increased and enriched intellectual experiences for quite young children, for the identification of creative individuals with recognition of their potential contributions to society, and for acceptance of the fact that motivation as intrinsic to the learner implies greater emphasis upon self-discovery, inquiry, and self-direction in the educative process. Mr. Naeny’s emphasis also is on the importance of programs which focus on personal fulfillment and self-realization. Administrative patterns must provide for frequent realignment of groups of students and for a nongraded structure which permits continuous progress in the several subjects, based upon the individual’s level of achievement and current learning rate in each field at a given time.
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