Effects of Change on Education For
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School library educators have long been sensitive to the fact that change in professional programs is necessary if their students are to live up to the image projected for them in official platforms. Their perennial concern has been that of establishing systematic joint planning with their colleagues in education. From such collaboration they hoped to correct two marked weaknesses in the professional preparation of the teacher and the librarian—the librarian’s ignorance of curriculum, learning theory, and instructional method and the teacher’s ignorance of libraries and their resources for students. In more recent times, library educators have pressed also for elimination of the dichotomy between print and non-print and the corresponding dual training of school librarians and audiovisual specialists. The evidence of their efforts is readily documented in journal articles and conference proceedings which have appeared since 1960.

Leaders in the audiovisual movement have also reacted to the increasing momentum of technological change in education and its implications for professional preparation. The Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, has shown its official interest through its sponsorship of seminars, its commission (known as the Professional Education of Media Specialists), and its publications. In addition, the U.S. Office of Education has supported a number of recent studies about the education of media specialists (See Additional References).

The problem of appropriate training for those who plan to work with the resources of teaching and learning in the schools is a large and complex one. In its ramifications it includes the use of the new
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media and materials created by technology and the earlier issues of educational content for librarians and resource information for teachers. The varied specialists in educational media do not agree about either the dimensions of the field or the functions and preparation of those who work in it, but they do concur about the need to keep working toward a consensus. The recommendation for a unified or coordinated program leading to a joint degree in the new *Standards for School Media Programs*¹ prepared and approved by the American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction thus represents an important milestone in school library education and service. Of interest also to the library educator is the recent position paper, “The Role of the Media Professional in Education,”² prepared for the Board of Directors of DAVI which describes the emerging role of the media professional, the characteristic tasks he performs, and the requirements for his professional education.

The most useful assessment of the effects of the changes detailed in earlier chapters upon school library education must deal in futures. My assumption does not deny that some institutions educating school librarians have already modified their programs, but it does reflect the conviction that the new *Standards*, by virtue of their official character, demand a careful analysis by all media educators for future planning. The DAVI position paper, although not officially adopted, provides insight into the perspective of that sector of the media field most closely related to the school library. It is my intent, therefore, to analyze both the *Standards* and the DAVI paper in terms of their definition of the function of the media specialist, the preparation needed for his work, and their implications for establishing a sequence of study and the administration of a unified program.

Both the *Standards* and the DAVI statement use a pragmatic approach to the preparation of the media specialist. They describe characteristic tasks and the education essential for their performance. Both statements separate tasks according to level of responsibility, i.e., the individual school, the multischool level, and the state level. Although the work is described in broad terms, e.g., “assist with selection of materials and equipment,” neither statement attempts to classify tasks under such familiar rubrics as selection, production, utilization, and administration. For comparative purposes, however, I have used these categories in an attempt to distinguish any differences there may be in the thinking of the audiovisual specialists when working alone and when working with librarians. If library educators...
and audiovisual educators are to collaborate in preparing joint programs, as recommended in the Standards, I deem it important to identify any differences in interpretation of function which may exist.

At the level of the individual school, few major differences about the media specialist’s work appear in the two documents. Both recognize tasks in selection, production, utilization, and administration. Only the Standards, however, note the responsibility of making available to faculty through a professional collection knowledge about recent trends in subject areas and education; only DAVI makes the point of assisting teachers and administrators in evaluating the results of use of instructional materials and technological resources for teaching. The greatest difference between them is in specifying work with students. DAVI mentions assistance of only two kinds—supervise students in operation and use of equipment and help students use “technology of communication.” In contrast, the Standards specify working directly with students in selecting and evaluating materials, in research and individualized learning, and in giving instruction in the use of the media center and its resources. They note also the responsibility of the media program to supply resources and services for the personal inquiry of students and for their extra-curricular work.

At the multischool or district level, the functions noted in both statements are primarily administrative and advisory, e.g., coordinate selection and evaluation of instructional materials; manage the organization, distribution, and maintenance of instructional materials and equipment; work with teachers, curriculum specialists, and administrators in design and implementation of instructional programs; and conduct experimentation and evaluation of media programs and projects. The Standards note responsibility for centralized processing of materials while DAVI describes responsibility for “the linking of communication functions within the school system to external communication systems at state, regional, and international (satellite) levels.” A major assumption in both statements is the creation at the multi-school level of a unit with sufficient staff to carry out these functions. The Standards make the assumption explicit: “In the past, professional staff members of the system media center have had to devote most of their time to purely administrative, technical, and business matters. With a sufficient number of supportive staff members, the system media specialists can assume in full degree their responsibilities as curriculum consultants, participants in planning and developing instructional and communications programs, and materials
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specialists.” The Standards’ recommendations apply to the district level while the DAVI statement pertains to county and regional programs as well. The functions specified by the DAVI paper for state and Federal levels have no counterpart in the Standards. The Standards note only the need for directors of school library service and of audiovisual service and of a cohesive media program for the state.

Thus, both the Standards and the DAVI position paper agree about the levels of service for the professional and his major functions. The greatest difference between them lies in the concept of service, particularly at the building level, with the Standards specifying a wide range of service to individual students, both for curricular and personal concerns, and assistance to the teacher in keeping him in touch with new knowledge. This difference is not surprising in view of the separatism of the audiovisual and library fields and the traditional emphasis in service of the two groups. Librarians have focused upon individualization of learning through materials adapted to unique needs and interests; they have sought also to insure a variety of viewpoints in materials. The audiovisual specialist has emphasized service to teachers for groups of students. The difference may also stem from the concept each group has of the most efficient utilization of learning resources in the future. An introductory paragraph in the DAVI paper affords insight into their interpretation of service: “the role of the media professional in education is changing from that of a keeper and dispenser of teaching aids to that of an analyst and designer of instructional systems who must be centrally involved in the planning of learning environments, and in providing for related support functions and evaluative procedures.” It is apparent that equipment will soon be readily available to permit intermixing of pictures, sound, and print. The audiovisual specialist apparently sees this as an opportunity to design packages for individual or group use to accomplish a specified learning objective. The librarian, speaking through the Standards, describes a service in which “media specialists have as their primary goal and responsibility the guidance of students in studying effectively, thinking objectively, and in acquiring interest in and enthusiasm for exploration and research.”

The two specialists will need to recognize their differences in viewpoint about the use of materials in promoting learning. Clearly, there is a need for both approaches. Many important kinds of learning are accomplished more efficiently by careful planning of ends and means (and media specialists have a role in the design of learning packages...
and the selection of materials for them). The nurture of individual interests—in reading or viewing or listening—and in independent discovery is an equally worthy goal which requires a different use of materials and a different kind of guidance from teacher and media specialist.

How much opportunity the media specialist of the future will have to implement either of these concepts of service obviously will be influenced by the work of groups outside the local school district. Curriculum packages can be produced either by teams of subject specialists (as in the physical science and biology projects) or by the education publishing industry. The amount of choice allowed faculty in individual schools in adapting and modifying instructional systems, created either by local or outside groups, will affect the use they make of local learning resources and services. Both statements assume a faculty with time and freedom to experiment with varied resources in planning learning and a media staff prepared to help them exploit resources and technology to this end. The advantages accruing to faculty, students, and librarians when there is opportunity to harness new equipment for learning are noted in recent testimony by the coordinator of the computer-directed remote access system at Oak Park and River Forest High School in Illinois: “The choices and possibilities available to the student as he conducts his self-study programs are multiplied. The opportunities for librarians to participate directly in designing and implementing instructional materials are expanded. In other words, a more effective integration of library, classroom, and department programs is produced.”

A final observation about the functions of the media specialist described in these two statements finds that neither specifies such traditional library services as storytelling or book talks.

The elements in the basic professional education of the media specialist and the broad areas of specialization beyond this core, defined briefly in both the Standards and the DAVI position paper are noted in Table 1.

Recommendations for those elements I have categorized as “Media Areas” differ in information services, noted only in the Standards, and in design and production of materials and application of technologies, noted only in the DAVI paper. In the areas of specialization, the chief variation is in the Standards’ identification of advanced study in subject areas and in content relevant to learning at a given developmental level (e.g., elementary school) and the DAVI listing of be-
**TABLE 1**  
*Preparation for the Media Specialist*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Areas</th>
<th>DAVI Position Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, evaluation, and selection of printed and audiovisual materials</td>
<td>Utilization and evaluation of educational media and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for utilization of materials by students, teachers, and other school personnel</td>
<td>Development of supervisory and in-service education activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and organization of materials and services</td>
<td>Organization of media collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives, function, and program of the media center</td>
<td>Administration and supervision of media programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information services</td>
<td>Design and production of various types of instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of various types of technologies to instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Background Areas</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Curriculum development and recent instructional trends at the pre-school, elementary, secondary, collegiate and/or adult levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials</td>
<td>Communication, learning, and perception theories as related to media and the utilization of instructional materials in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In relation to type of school (e.g. expertise in materials, curriculum, instructional methods, and characteristics of students)</td>
<td>Advanced elements of librarianship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In subject area (graduate study)</td>
<td>Information science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>Advanced elements of educational broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed instruction</td>
<td>Programmed instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic and computerized processes</td>
<td>Computer-assisted instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
behavioral research and advanced elements of library science. In the "Background" category, the differences are deeper than appear on paper because the DAVI statement assumes a basic professional training in education; the elements in their list, therefore, are intended as advanced study. The Standards introduce their listing as "knowledge of certain fundamentals of professional education" implying beginning courses while advanced study is suggested only in relation to type of school specialization.

The determination for sequence of content is a knotty problem. The pragmatic approach asks, "What does the media specialist working at this level need to know?" and tries to adapt preparation to tasks. This is the traditional base from which program designers have worked in both library and media fields. Swanson warns of the risk in this approach:

Library education must be built upon sound intellectual foundations, but at the same time it cannot ignore the vocational skills needed in the practice of librarianship. These vocational needs of the profession are great, and the skills not difficult to recognize; but their intellectual content is often obscure and subject to divided opinion. We suggest here that this intellectual content is just that aspect that does stand the test of time. For education to respond solely to today's needs may result in failure to produce tomorrow's leaders, so the search for the proper foundations is of more than academic interest.7

Aware of the need to identify the structure of the field, the educator also must attempt to give some coherence and order to the preparation of the prospective media specialist now entering the vocation and/or profession.

The Standards and the DAVI paper offer only a general guide to the differences in function among the specialists in the field although the Standards recognize that the size of the media program and the level at which it operates will affect the competencies demanded of staff and director. Similarly, the statements offer no definite guidelines to recommended sequence of content. Nonetheless, they have major implications for the library educator and the audiovisual educator.

I suggest the first implication is for a careful review of the fifth year program in library science and audiovisual education. Teachers in these two fields should translate the broad categories of content described in these documents into major concepts and understandings and organize them in sequential pattern. Eventually they will have
to decide about existing courses in library science and audiovisual education, but the likelihood of a coherent program, freed from unnecessary duplication, is greater if they start from scratch to plan rather than shifting established courses into a new pattern. Of particular import is the need to eliminate technical and clerical skills from the curriculum of the prospective professional media specialist. Recent definitions of the subprofessional class in the library recommended by Asheim and the Interdivisional Ad Hoc Committee of the Library Education and the Library Administration Division of the American Library Association, together with those of the Standards provide a working basis for this aspect of curriculum restructuring. The current DAVI study and the research planned in connection with the new Knapp project will provide additional valuable data for curriculum revision.

Such a review by the library educator and his audiovisual counterpart would offer a sound basis for organizing content—whether by format (print or non-print), subject (humanities, social science, science) or by grade level (elementary or secondary). From their collaboration will evolve decisions about the need for new courses and the usefulness of old ones. Sticky questions will appear. What about courses in production and information (or reference)—the major differences in content recommended in the Standards and the DAVI paper? How much technical skill in production does the student need to function as a supervisor of technicians who will handle the actual work? Do we exploit students when we train them to handle non-professional work because the school system fails in provision of adequate supportive staff? Should every media specialist be prepared to retrieve information from books and magazines to answer queries from faculty and students? How much theory about cataloging and classification is essential now that most such work is handled from a central office or purchased from a business firm? What about storytelling? What about internship? How much, if any, is desirable? At what point in the program? What provisions are necessary to relate theory to practice?

After decisions have been made about content and sequence of the basic media core in the fifth year program, there is the related decision about what courses, if any, might be offered to undergraduate students who need to start work at the end of four years of college. The undergraduate minor, common in library science, is rare in audiovisual education. The demand for manpower and the advantages for...
recruitment are the customary justification of undergraduate study; such arguments still appear valid.

A second implication of these documents is the need for the school library educator to study with his colleagues in education the professional courses required for teacher certification of the media specialist and the additional competencies beyond this level in curriculum development, learning and perception theory, etc., which the specialist should have. Apropos of teacher certification are such questions as: does the student electing a minor in media at the undergraduate level need precisely the same courses as the prospective teacher? Should his student teaching be done in the classroom or the media center? Is there a place for the special training of the media specialist in the Master of Arts in Teaching program many universities have set up for the liberal arts graduate who starts his teaching preparation at the fifth year? Kovacs, in a recent master’s thesis, analyzes the University of Chicago combined program.12 Apropos of the master’s program is the question of the desirability of curriculum courses in a subject area rather than a general course. Media students with limited teaching experience may find the study of curriculum development in the social sciences, for example, of greater use than general theory. (Experience with students at Wayne State University supports this point.) Frank discussion with teachers of teachers should also stimulate exchanges about the media specialist’s role in designing curriculum and in guiding students in independent study. Many librarians and audiovisualists believe their function has been severely curtailed by unflattering images—the “keeper of the books” and the “equipment pusher.” Dialogue with educationists about the unique service of the building media specialist may help to develop the operating partnership needed in the school between him and the teacher by opening for discussion the crucial issue of preparation of the prospective teacher in instructional resources.

Only after decisions have been made about basic core media and education courses does the question of specialization for library science or audiovisual instruction at the master’s level seem appropriate. How much specialization and of what kind should relate to the opportunities and requirements for advanced study in the media field.

The recommendation for a unified media program in the Standards creates prickly problems for planning advanced study. What should be the requirements for the administrator or coordinator in this expanding service? Is there a place for the school library administrator
or only for the administrator with competencies in library science and audiovisual instruction and broadcasting? The problem of advanced study is compounded by the difficulties the library profession and the media profession currently face in their search for identity.

Some librarians seek the intellectual foundations of their profession in the light of the rapidly developing discipline of information science. The topics discussed at the 1964 University of Chicago Graduate Library School Conference on this issue suggests some of the directions explored: society and the use of libraries; systems planning and analysis; intellectual access to information; and development of book collections. Other librarians are restudying position classification and educational requirements for the major levels. Two recent documents—Asheim's exploratory position paper and the proposal of the Maryland Library Association—are evidence of the current division of opinion in the profession.

The DAVI leadership, on the other hand, debates whether there is a profession of media and/or the requirements needed to create one. The membership vote, scheduled for December 1968, on a change of name for the DAVI organization is additional evidence of the difficulty in establishing the boundaries of the field. The three proposed names—Association for Instructional Technology, Educational Media Association, or American Educational Communication Association—illustrate the range of opinion.

The Standards and the DAVI position paper afford little concrete assistance to those concerned with designing sixth-year specialist and doctoral programs. They identify areas of specialization and suggest the need for administrators to direct a unified program. The Standards recommend separate directors of school library and audiovisual services at the state level with cohesion in program to be achieved either under a unified or coordinated administrative organization.

On a pragmatic basis, I suggest there is a clear need—and one recognized by a number of library leaders and institutions at the present time—for sixth-year specialist programs. I believe two types of curriculum are essential at this level. The first type is that designed for the prospective administrator of a media program in the large school, in the district or region, or in the state. Such a curriculum will require sufficient flexibility to serve two groups of students—those with masters' degrees in either audiovisual instruction or library science and those who will eventually come as graduates of the new unified master's program. A second type of sixth-year curriculum is
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needed, I submit, for the graduate student who seeks not administrative responsibility but rather greater knowledge in subject disciplines or in such specialties as computer-assisted instruction, information retrieval, or educational broadcasting.

Not all institutions will have the faculty required to offer both types of sixth-year programs. Those preparing administrators will need to draw upon faculty from library science as well as education, communication, and the various segments of the audiovisual field. For the second type of sixth-year specialist program, library science departments in universities without teaching faculty in the media field may design a curriculum for subject specialists in collaboration with faculty from the discipline and education, e.g., further specialization in the bibliography and literature of selected subject areas combined with advanced study in related curriculum fields. (Such a program is essential for the librarian in the secondary school subject-division library who attempts to help teachers keep up in their field and to guide the often rigorous independent study of students.) Similarly, advanced study in educational broadcasting and programmed instruction would not require faculty from library science.

The doctoral program is of major importance. Librarianship (school librarianship in particular) and the media field need basic and applied research to extend theory and intensify special knowledge. Graduates of such programs are especially needed for college and university teaching. Hayes charges, “library education has become stale and trite. Library schools have, until recently, been observers of the changes taking place in librarianship, not participants or, better yet, leaders of them.”¹⁷ His rationale, with which I agree, is: “research productivity insures that as a teacher the individual will not become stale and trite, that he will continually be aware of the state of the art, not as an observer but as a participant.”¹⁷

One other important aspect of curriculum planning noted by the Standards is the provision of continuing education on a short term basis for librarians in the field to upgrade and expand their professional knowledge and competency. A wide variety of needs may be served by workshops, institutes, and conferences. For example, to become familiar with the array of newer media and materials and to develop skills in their selection and evaluation; to catch up with recent developments in curriculum and learning theory and their relevance to the newer media; and to use newer media in solving the learning problems of the disadvantaged.
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The problem of arranging the conditions in which the changes in the education of the school librarian may best take place is essentially an administrative one. Involved are two sets of problems—one the province of the university, the other, of the state agency.

At the university level, the new programs raise questions about the degree to be granted, the alignment of teaching departments, and the resources and facilities required. The recommendations of the Standards for a unified program or a coordinated program leading to a joint degree may deprive the "new" school media specialist of the security of the professional library degree as an insurance policy against the time he might wish to switch to public or college librarianship. Since I strongly believe that only the individual who is vitally interested in the education of children and youth is qualified for school library or media service, the possible loss of manpower and recruitment problems do not trouble me.

Interdisciplinary research and area studies are an accepted way-of-life in the contemporary university. A joint degree program requires no formal realignment of departments or schools at its inception although it may influence later change. The many single purpose library science departments in colleges of education are already in excellent positions to administer a coordinated media program. The library science department's contribution to the media specialist program is a vital one and the relationship between this department and the media program must be maintained in any reorganization that may eventually take place. Henne's comment in 1962 bears repeating here: "library education curriculums have content and methodology that contribute to the intellectual and professional growth of students, that do not waste their time, that sharpen their critical powers (constructive ones) and that develop their evaluative abilities."

The university must also support the unified media program by providing adequate resources: trade and textbooks for children and youth; audiovisual materials and equipment; curricular guides for teachers; installations equipped for dial-access, computer-assisted instruction, and programing; and laboratories for student production of learning materials. The media program will also require access to school media centers with good facilities and programs where the prospective media specialist can have internship experience under the joint supervision of his university teacher and the building specialist.

Changes in educational programs at the university can be stymied
by inflexible certification at the state level. The new Standards state the problem cogently:

Study and redefinitions of certification requirements need to be undertaken in the light of currently accepted objectives of media centers, of services performed by media specialists, of recommended standards for size of staff, and types of positions in centers having more than one media specialist. . . . Certification requirements must neither hinder the development of excellent media programs in schools nor regiment the creativity and experimentation of the professional schools or departments.

As in the matter of professional education, the problem must be resolved concerning the dichotomy of certification—one for school librarians and one for audiovisual specialists. Some kind of certification allowing for all variant patterns that have been recognized seems essential. This not only would speed the development of unified media centers but would also help to correct the serious manpower problem and promote recruitment.19

According to ancient Chinese philosophy, the journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. The one step has been taken. The new Standards are here—conceived by school librarians and audiovisual specialists and approved by their parent organizations. The journey for which they point takes the library educator again to familiar problems of former years—the balance between education and library science, the dual training of librarian and audiovisual specialist, the ladder of preparation from undergraduate to doctorate, the instruction of teachers about materials and libraries. The terrain may be rocky, but the destination—quality education for all American youth—makes the effort worthwhile.
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