Standards for Library Media Centers in Schools for the Deaf: An Updated Perspective

JEANINA MECCA ODIEN

ABSTRACT

SEVEN MAJOR NATIONAL STANDARDS for school libraries or school media centers have been developed since 1920. The most important and successful of these standards, for a variety of reasons, was the 1960 *Standards for School Library Programs* issued by the American Library Association (ALA). In 1967, the Convention of American Instructors for the Deaf published *Standards for Library-Media Centers in Schools for the Deaf: A Handbook for the Development of Library-Media Programs,* which paralleled the development of the 1960 standards in method and scope. Changes taking place in society and in the field of education have encouraged the further evolution of standards for school library media programs and for public library services to people who are deaf. It is now time to develop standards for school library media programs for deaf students that look at the full spectrum of the learners and their educational needs within the widest range of placement options.

INTRODUCTION

In 1967, the Convention of American Instructors for the Deaf published *Standards for Library-Media Centers in Schools for the Deaf: A Handbook for the Development of Library-Media Programs.* These standards had their origin in the *Standards for School Library Programs* prepared by the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) (American Association of School Librarians, 1960) and in a *Status Study of Library Services in Schools for the Deaf, 1964-*

66 (Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, 1967, p. 1). Since
1960, several other publications on standards have been published.
The most current, *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library
Media Programs* (AASL & AECT, 1988), was prepared by AASL and
the Association for Educational Communications and Technology
(AECT) and published by the American Library Association.

The scope of the school library media center has changed
dramatically since 1960. *Information Power* stresses the need for school
library media programs to prepare for the future. A perspective for
library media center programming and a projection of future needs
and direction for library media centers at schools for the deaf can
be provided if librarians review the current ALA standards when
considering the unique educational needs of library users at these
schools.

This article will present and discuss a historical overview of
standards for school libraries/school library media centers, the
development of major national standards, the influences that the
various standards have had on the profession, and the controversy
within the profession as to the definition and future role of standards
in the development of school library media programs, particularly
as they apply to schools for the deaf.

STANDARDS: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Seven major national standards for school libraries have evolved
since those issued in 1920 by the National Education Association
and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
(Jones, 1982, p. 13). These standards, established for secondary schools,
were based on a series of surveys of what was generally in practice.
They provided a quantitative statement of "requirements for a number
of books, type of facilities and amount of a budget, according to
size of enrollment" (Hug, 1989, p. 38). These standards, often referred
to as the "Certain" standards, were successful because they "gave
school administrators what they wanted—something specific, definite
and official" (Jones, 1982, p. 14). In 1925, the National Education
Association and the American Library Association issued the
Elementary School Library Standards as a companion statement to
the 1920 "Certain" standards, but it was not as widely accepted as
the secondary school standards (Jones, 1982, pp. 13-14).

As the concept of school libraries shifted from one of modeling
public libraries to one of coordinating library programs with
educational programs and to building collections that supported the
curriculum, the changing needs paved the way for the next set of
standards. *School Libraries for Today and Tomorrow: Functions and
Standards,* issued in 1945 by the ALA Committee on Post War

Planning, attempted to deal with these changes by providing the added dimension of service to students and staff. It also provided criteria for evaluating programs and presented quantitative tabular measures for staffing, collections, expenditure, and space. These provisions established the 1945 standards as the forerunner of modern school library media standards from 1960 to the present (Jones, 1982, p. 14).

Major societal, educational, and technological changes during the mid-1950s set the stage for the next set of national standards, *Standards for School Library Programs* issued in 1960 by ALA (Hug, 1989, p. 38). The 1960 standards have been considered by many to be the best and most successful for a number of reasons. The standards supplied an authoritative model which was based on the survey method of research combined with the judgment of experts. Also, a concerted effort was made to explain and promote the standards to school personnel, jargon was avoided, and the goals presented were realistic and achievable. It is important to note that the 1960 standards were requested by school personnel who needed a guide which reflected the many changes taking place in schools (Jones, 1982, p. 14). The 1960 standards provided a quantitative measure which "directly influenced developing collections, improving facilities, expanding school library media programs, and securing qualified professionals" (Hug, 1989, p. 39).

It was in this atmosphere that work was initiated to better understand library programs in schools for the deaf. A project to accomplish this was undertaken for the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf under a contract (OE 04-19-066) sponsored by Captioned Films for the Deaf. The project was to be done in two phases. Phase I (1964-66) was a status survey of library services in schools for the deaf that gathered, described, organized, and tabulated the survey information and provided a comparison of that information with the 1960 ALA-NEA *Standards for School Library Programs.* The survey was conducted via on-site visits to thirty schools for the deaf. The choice of schools was based on geographic distribution of public residential, private, and denominational residential and public day schools (Cory, 1967, p. 701).

Five areas of school service were covered by the survey: program, personnel, collections, quarters and equipment, and annual expenditures for print and nonprint materials. Phase II allowed for the development of the *Standards for Library-Media Centers in Schools for the Deaf* by the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf in 1967, which addressed the same five areas of service used in the survey. The formation of the 1967 *Standards for Library-Media Centers in Schools for the Deaf* was a coordinated effort to use the

then current *Standards for School Library Programs* (AASL, 1960) together with the information and recommendations gathered from the status survey, which were analyzed according to the uniqueness of the user population in schools for the deaf.

There are many things to consider when viewing this special population and the schools' facilities. In discussing the special characteristics of schools for the deaf, the 1967 standards noted that "the majority of schools for the deaf are totally, or partially, residential" (Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, 1967, p. 16). Schools for the deaf serve several distinct groups of users, each with different needs. The diversity of users include wide age ranges of students, from preschool through advanced grades; administrative staff and faculty; student teachers; guidance counselors and psychiatric staff; dormitory supervisors and houseparents; and, in a few schools, research departments (Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, 1967, p. 6). In addition to the distinct differences of the varied users and the wide age span to be served, other factors needed to be taken into consideration when the initial standards were being established—especially in the area of staffing. The small size of classes in schools for the deaf limited the number of students to be served during one class period. Heavy use of all types of visual materials; the existence of large campus-type schools with several library media centers decentralized in several buildings; the presence of students on campus during evenings (and sometimes weekends); the length of time needed for staff members to communicate with each deaf student, along with special learning, reading, and communication problems that existed, all heavily influenced the resulting 1967 standards (Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, 1967, p. 21).

The distinct learning needs of hearing-impaired children must also be addressed. Language acquisition for this group is difficult. Bunch (1987) identified seven special needs of hearing-impaired learners: special language; speech instruction; aural habilitation instruction; instruction through manual methods; a visual emphasis in instruction; differentiated curricula for different groups; and specially created support materials (p. 5). The need for visual compensation for auditory limitations places an emphasis on visually oriented instruction thereby emphasizing the use of media to assist in instruction (Bunch, 1987, p. 8). Darling (1967) noted "that these schools educate children with the most severe handicap of all educable children" and "to accomplish the same educational goals, media services for the deaf need to be three times as extensive as those for the hearing" (p. 712). Thus media centers in schools for the deaf require higher standards than those required for other schools (p. 718).

The *Standards for Library-Media Centers in Schools for the Deaf* also unanimously proposed that the term "library media center" be used to describe the "integrated type of collections and services which were recommended as desirable" and that they be "unified collections of all materials . . . housed, organized, and indexed (cataloged) together and circulated for the convenience of all the users" (Cory, 1967, p. 702). In concept and definition, this was a step ahead of both the 1960 *Standards for School Library Programs* (AASL) and the 1969 *Standards for School Media Programs* (AASL & Department of Audiovisual Instruction [DAVI] of the National Education Association). The 1960 standards could basically be characterized as a more quantitative than qualitative document which began to address the metamorphosis of school "libraries" into school "library media centers" without generating those terms. It was with the *Standards for School Media Programs* (AASL & DAVI, 1969) that a change in traditional terms and occupational titles was introduced. Although these standards only provided a strong recommendation for unified media whenever possible, the "practicality of the unified media concept was readily seen. States quickly moved to assimilate the unified media concept into the philosophical base and quantitative recommendations of their standards" (Jones, 1982, p. 15).

The 1969 standards were unique in that they were the first school library standards developed by a joint effort of two professional associations, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and the Department of Audio Visual Instruction (DAVI), which later became the Association of Educational Communication and Technology (AECT). As with any merging and changing of tradition, conflict and controversy arose. Hug (1989) stated, "the 1969 *Standards* started deep controversies over form, contents, and use of national standards—controversy that increased with the publication of the 1975 and then the 1988 guidelines. The greatest controversies were over terminology and the roles of school library media professionals" (p. 43).

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS

What exactly is meant by a standard? That question has been debated for quite some time. "Are library standards a model to be followed or are they a rule established by authority" (Wallace, 1972b, p. 41)? When discussing standards, an overall definition of the term is elusive. Wallace (1972) observed that the term "standard" had thirty-six historical meanings listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary* with key words being "authority, custom, model, measure, quantity, and quality" (pp. 31-32).

Bloss (1981) quotes the Standards Committee of the American
Library Association (1976) as defining an ALA Standard as

> a role or model of quantity, quality, extent, level or correctness and
> promulgated . . . as a gauge by which the degree of attainment of the
> official ALA goals can be measured.
>   An ALA Standard is intended as a criterion by which current judgments
> of value, quality, fitness, and correctness are confirmed. In order that
> a particular library and information service, activity, resource or control
> thereof, facility or aspect of work (e.g. personnel, budget, organization,
> etc.) can be determined to meet, or fail to meet, this criterion, an ALA
> standard must incorporate all the following: (1) statement of principle(s),
> (2) detail as to necessary elements, (3) reference to accepted definitions
> of terminology, (4) where applicable, formulae, scales or specifications
> that can be applied with a high degree of ease and certainty. (p. 287)

Standards of all types have been developed that influence and
have impact on libraries but that are not, as such, library standards—
that is, measurement and physical standards, product standards, and
work standards. Standards vary by type: accreditation, personnel,
diagnostic (benchmark), and projective. Accreditation deals with
establishing a minimum level before some benefit is received from
the issuing authority. Personnel standards relate to employment issues
(tenure, certification, and hours, for example). Diagnostic
(benchmark) standards are based on conditions in existence—superior
services that others would model. Projective standards are guidelines
for development—a vision of what should be (Wallace, 1972a, pp.
33-36). However,

> regardless of type, there are definite requirements that must be met when
> formulating standards. Without these, standards have little real value
> or meaning. Some requirements for meaningful standards include:
>
> 1. Research and the compilation of statistics in the areas being
>   standardized, perhaps the most urgent and basic of all needs in the
>   development of standards.
> 2. Measurability, to provide a basis for evaluation and evaluative
>   judgment. A service or other activity must be measurable in order
>   to determine if the function in question "meets the standard."
> 3. The standard must be clearly defined and definable so that it conveys
>   the same meaning to all who read it.
> 4. Appropriateness to the institution or service to be evaluated is
>   essential.
> 5. Authoritativeness, which bases the standard on practices and research,
>   not on assumption or prejudices.
> 6. In order to be effective, the standard must be realistic. Otherwise,
>   it will be ignored and result in wasted effort." (Lancaster, 1977, p. 290)

Lancaster (1977) concludes that library standards "have a tendency
to be guidelines rather than true enforceable standards" (p. 296).

How could seven major national school library standards have
evolved since 1920 without a clear definition? In some instances the
difference in word usage such as "criteria" or "guidelines" instead
of "standards" was seen as a problem of semantics. More so, it has

become a philosophical viewpoint, with the term "standard" being the stronger term for some. Whereas standards can serve as guidelines, guidelines are not perceived to be equal to standards. The terms "guidelines" and "qualitative standards" become more synonymous, especially in areas of service and programs (Henne, 1972, p. 242). A main reason to use the term "standards" stems from the desire to improve financial support for libraries—to act as an upgrading force. With more emphasis on funding accountability and justification, especially in areas of quantitative measures (that is, collections, staffing, and space) (Bloss, 1981, p. 291), a stronger term used on the national and state level may have more impact. To those who advocate the use of "guidelines," the word seems more encouraging, flexible, and democratic (Henne, 1972, p. 242). Another perspective on the terminology issue is that standards of excellence provide goals for the profession to help librarians remember the discrepancies between the programs they have and the programs they are aiming to build, to keep them from adapting to the level of mediocrity which most school districts have budgeted for their media programs (Fast, 1976, p. 122).

In discussing funding and the authority to enforce an established standard, one may wonder whether any national organization has the authority to enforce established standards. As well received as the 1960 standards were, their success was probably due more to the fact that those organizations with the authority to enforce them were actively seeking standards that they could apply. Funds were available to "sell" as well as to increase the quantitative aspects of the standards, making the standards "achievable." Liesener (1989) observed: "National standards are a model not a rule. National professional organizations do not have the authority or the means for any kind of enforcement of standards. Therefore, guidelines developed at the national level are intended to influence the standards, guidelines and policies developed at other levels" (p. 27). The value of this influence should not be minimized, especially in light of the impact of past standards, particularly those developed in 1960. However, the influence and credibility of guidelines would be greatly enhanced if improved research measures were used in their development. Since school library media standards must take into account the greater educational community in which they must apply, input from national educational leaders—those with the power to make the changes—needs to be addressed. Hug (1989) concludes that: "1975 and 1988 standards tend toward being both theoretical and descriptive at a time when schools and state education agencies are demanding procedures that promote exact standards and accountability at all levels" (p. 44).

Each new standard from 1925 to 1988 built upon the prior
standards adding new dimensions and increasing quantitative
measures that were reflective of the changes in educational trends
and society. Each in turn has helped shape and strengthen the school
library program. Earlier standards concentrated on quantitative
measures based on status surveys—an establishment of norms based
on current practice. The continual updating of status surveys provided
an ongoing consensus and a sense of what was happening with "the
rank and file," an evaluation of the extent of implementation of
past standards/guidelines when looking toward future developments.
However, a tabulation of "things" does not encompass the wider
ranges of services and programs which must be justified by research
application. Bloss (1981) pointed out that "service standards would
be more credible, particularly among 'non-library' authorities, if
standards were to be based upon solid research" (p. 292) and, further,
that increased concern for accountability by appropriating authorities
will no longer support "a plea based upon generalities—or wisdom
of the seers" (p. 307).

    The cause of developing credible standards would be helped by
taking the best from the methods used in forming past standards,
together with current research methods applicable in the field, to
establish evaluative measures which would provide accountability
and increase credibility both within and outside the profession.
Ploch's (1972) model for developing library standards suggested three
levels of development: minimal, optimal, and projective (pp. 67-68).
He suggested the gathering of quantitative and qualitative data from
as many institutions as possible. This would establish norms and
help provide a mechanism for reevaluation. The mention of "as many
institutions as possible" points out the need to recognize that many
school libraries are not in any position, for a variety of reasons, to
qualify for inclusion on status surveys because there is a tendency
for "standards . . . to be drawn from observation and analysis of
statistics and performance in 'better' libraries" (Bloss, 1981, p. 292).
The programs in these school libraries are the ones that most need
the support of enforceable minimal "standards" and evaluative
systems. If programs of high service or excellence are being chosen
as models in guidelines, and if the measure of excellence is acceptable,
then it is valid to note and analyze the number and ranges of programs
that fall below that measure.

    All the factors required to provide standards need to be addressed.
Of particular importance is the issue of authority to enforce the
standard. Joint consensus of those in the field as well as those with
the authority to direct the change should be applied. Identification
of change agents should be a first step in the process of standards

development. An invitation into the process would be next. When levels of needs and problems have been examined, national organizations can then address the development of standards based on a scientific research approach. If these steps are followed, the organization or agency with the authority to enforce the measure would have a solid base from which it could lobby for implementation. For school libraries, in most cases, this organization would be the governing state agency.

Would the quality of the measure then be in debate? Hannigan (1982) points out that, in the history of standards, the level of research sophistication was low (p. 52). There is also a need to delineate the areas to be incorporated into the measure. Traditionally, standards have included collection size, collection type, and facilities which are material oriented. Measures are now needed for services that will place an emphasis on the users' needs and intended outcomes.

Information Power (AASL & AECT, 1988) followed the same developmental pattern as past standards. The Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education (1985-86) conducted a survey of school library media centers (both public and private). This survey provides the most complete updated overview of school library media programs on the national level. However, the data in the document used only public school samples and excluded any nontraditional entries such as combination schools, alternative schools, vocational or technical schools, or schools providing special education to handicapped children. The survey added measures to determine high service programs based on how many of the twenty-two services listed were occasionally or routinely performed. After ranking the high service programs, 571 schools out of the 3,527 sampled were included in the final tabulation (AASL & AECT, 1988, p. 114). Again, model programs were used as a measure for others to follow in the form of a projected standard. Using Ploch's (1972) model for standards development, *Information Power* would be the third section of development, projective in nature.

INFLUENCE OF STANDARDS ON THE PROFESSION

It would be an understatement to say that much has changed in society and in deaf education since the 1967 *School Library-Media Standards for the Deaf* was published. The need for review, reevaluation, and updating of the standards is long overdue. No published evaluative studies have been made to determine if the 1967 standards were adopted and implemented by schools for the deaf; their impact on schools for the deaf was never ascertained. A detailed status survey, including measures for services, should be done if for no other reason than establishing a picture of what currently exists.

The special needs of deaf students are as relevant today as they were in 1967. Many of the unique characteristics of residential schools for the deaf also still exist, although there have been some important changes both in residential programs and in the overall field of deaf education.

The Deaf School Population

Societal and educational perspectives, in general, have undergone many changes in the past twenty years. Education of deaf children is no different in that respect. Through the years, a great deal of controversy and debate have surrounded the issues of where, how, and what to teach deaf children. "Where" refers to the appropriate educational placement of a deaf child; "how" is the means of instruction—either oral/manual or, recently, manual/manual; and "what" encompasses matters of curriculum. Presently, the debates are concurrent (Moores, 1991, p. 35). These controversies reflect the ongoing issues in the education of deaf children, and, consequently, these are the issues that need to be considered when addressing school library programming. However, before further discussion of issues and changes, a clear understanding of what is meant by "deaf" in the educational sense needs to be addressed.

Deaf people are not a homogeneous grouping; different types and levels as well as onset of hearing losses affect the educational process of these individuals. Definitions of the words *hearing loss, deaf, hearing impaired, hard of hearing,* and *hearing disabled* are not consistent in use or in definition. A deaf person, according to the Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf (CEASD), is "one whose hearing is disabled to an extent (usually 70 dB ISO or greater) that precludes the understanding of speech through the ear alone, with or without the use of a hearing aid" (Moores, 1987, p. 9).

Deaf children do not bring the same language skills into the school experience as do their hearing peers. Lucas (1983) noted that "children who have partial hearing may have difficulty in developing language because they may hear only parts of words. The sound symbols they hear are distorted and difficult to distinguish" (p. 64). "The teaching of language to the deaf and the development of a meaningful adequate vocabulary have always been the chief obstacles to overcome in the education of the deaf" (Pendell, 1971, p. 446).

The levels or degrees of deafness are important in understanding possible types of educational placement and the situations in which the school library media program would impact on deaf children. The following levels exist as a guide for educational placement: Level I, 35-54 dB loss (mild); Level II, 55-69 dB loss (moderate); Level III,

70-89 dB+ loss (severe); and Level IV, 90 dB loss (profound) (Moores, 1987, p. 9).

The age of the individual at onset of hearing loss also has a great impact on the educational process. A prelingually deaf child— one whose hearing loss was present at birth or occurred prior to any speech and language development (Moores, 1987, p. 9)—has not had the opportunity to attach sound symbols to objects; there is no peripheral exposure to language.

School Programs for Deaf Children

Historically, most deaf children were educated in state residential schools. Great changes in the pattern and type of school placement have occurred since the passage of PL 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1971. PL 94-142 shifted responsibility for educating handicapped children to the public school systems, causing an increasing dispersion of hearing-impaired students to a greater number of educational institutions throughout the country" (Brown, 1987, p. 6). Moores (1987) stated that:

> by 1984 education of the deaf had become almost exclusively a public school responsibility, probably largely because of the free appropriate public education requirements of PL 94-142. There was also a movement, although much less pronounced, away from residential school placement and toward enrollment in day classes. To some extent this was probably an effect of the least restrictive environment requirements of PL 94-142. Substantial numbers of deaf students, however, continue to attend residential schools, which enroll approximately one-third of the deaf students in the United States. One significant change from the past is that approximately 40 percent of residential school students attend school on a day basis; that is, they commute to school from home. (p. 22)

Wright (1989) notes that "the least restrictive environment . . . will increase the numbers of children and families of the hearing impaired who are in the service area of the public library and the school library media center" (p. 87).

The types of school placement alternatives are:

1. residential schools, which house as well as educate students. Forty percent of students in residential schools attend on a day basis;
2. day schools, which are for deaf children only;
3. day classes for hearing-impaired children in public schools, where deaf children may be self contained in a classroom, or may spend some or part of their time in a regular classroom;
4. resource rooms, where deaf children spend the day in regular class, but have individualized services part of the day in a special classroom;
5. itinerant programs, where deaf children attend regular classes full time and receive support services from an "itinerant" teacher who may work with children from several different schools. Support services vary from daily to weekly schedules. (Moores, 1987, p. 18)

Statistics still point to the need for residential or day programs where the school population is exclusively hearing impaired. As

previously noted, residential schools enroll one-third of all deaf students in the United States. These schools also have proportionally higher numbers of students in the profoundly and severely deaf categories. Profoundly deaf students comprise 69 percent of the population at residential schools, 60 percent in day programs, 43 percent in local but not integrated programs, and only 23 percent in integrated programs. Of the student population in residential schools, 90 percent are in the severe to profoundly deaf range; this figure falls to 81 percent in day schools, 66 percent in local nonintegrated programs, and approximately 39 percent in local integrated programs (Schildroth, 1991, p. 160).

Media Center Standards

Standards development in public libraries have taken library services for deaf people into consideration through the work of the Library Services to the Deaf Section of the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA) and through their publication *Guidelines for Public Library Service to Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons* (Prine & Wright, 1982, p. 105). These standards should be considered in the development of school library media center standards, given the scope of PL 94-142 on total library service (Hannigan, 1982, p. 58) and the effects of the "least restrictive environment" aspect of the law.

The unique learning needs of deaf students and, in many instances, the unique educational placement process of deaf children, point to a continued need for standards specific to schools for the deaf. Although deaf students are a heterogeneous group, state schools for the deaf have similar needs and characteristics since they deal exclusively with deaf children of all ages (Pendell, 1971, p. 446). In addition to characteristics listed in the 1967 standards, some current shifts in educational trends provide additional considerations: an increase in service to deaf children with multiple handicaps, the inclusion of early intervention programs for infants and parents, provision of additional technology not "typical" in other libraries, increased involvement with networking systems in providing awareness, and shared access to information on deafness.

SUMMARY

Whether addressed as standards or guidelines, publications from national organizations have impacted on the library field. Standards, in the sense of the "Certain" or 1960 *Standards for School Library Programs* may no longer be feasible. The educational community at large—without documented research, statistical support, and evaluative measures—is not inclined to implement standards.

Today's educational climate and circumstances, however, have much in common with the pervasive atmosphere that ushered in the 1960 *Standards for School Library Programs.* There is great impetus for change in the education of children. The emphasis now is on learner outcome and accountability of the educational community. As Hug (1989) points out, schools and state education agencies are seeking input and "demanding procedures that promote exact standards and accountability at all levels" (p. 44). The stage has been set: it is now up to the profession to meet the challenge.

Bloss (1981) notes that "quantitative standards cannot be applied successfully without simultaneous use of qualitative standards or principles and guidelines for the particular kind of library service ... qualitative standards must come first" (p. 289). *Information Power* (AASL & AECT, 1988) provides that qualitative mission—i.e., that projective standard or goal. Rather than debating whether *Information Power* is a standard on its own, perhaps one can view it as the first step in developing current standards—which in turn is part of a greater historical continuum.

The quantitative aspects of *Information Power* were based on the same research mode of status survey, with the added dimension of including service areas rated by frequency of the service being provided. However, the report only described the high service programs. A measure is needed now to show a direct correlation between high service programs and the documented effectiveness of these programs on the school community. A follow-up study designed to provide that necessary documentation could be initiated using the tabulated 571 schools from *Information Power.* Analysis of the remaining 2,956 programs in the 3,527 sample might uncover other research options, opportunities for evaluating the "ought to be" against the reality of "what is." Further studies are needed to analyze the "nontypical" programs—such as combination schools, alternative schools, vocational or technical schools—and schools providing special education to handicapped students which were excluded from the *Information Power* tabulation. Bloss (1981) proposed using school library media centers as a testing ground for establishing standards by scientific means (p. 305).

Advocating for change is an important area that national organizations can address. Promoting the implementation of guidelines or standards at each level of development is critical. The 1960 standards were promoted via the demonstration programs established by the Knapp School Libraries Project. This project provided a massive informational promotion of the 1960 standards; states were encouraged, using national leadership conferences, to achieve goals with the highest priority (Sullivan, 1967, p. 689).

The development of the 1967 *Standards for School Library-Media Centers in Schools for the Deaf* paralleled the development of the 1960 *Standards for School Library Programs* in method and scope. Standards for school library media programs have continued to evolve, urged on by the changes taking place in society and in the field of education. Standards for public library service to people who are deaf have already been initiated. It is now time for school library media services for deaf children to do the same. The need for standards development in school library media programs for deaf students must look at the full spectrum of the learners and their educational needs within the widest range of placement options.

REFERENCES

American Association of School Librarians. (1960). *Standards for school library programs.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

American Association of School Librarians & Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1988). *Information power: Guidelines for school library media programs.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

American Association of School Librarians & Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association. (1969). *Standards for school media programs.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

American Library Association. Committee on Post-War Planning. (1945). *School libraries for today and tomorrow: Functions and standards* (Planning for Libraries no. 5). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Bloss, M. (1981). Research and standards for library service. *Library Research, 2*(4), 285-308.

Brown, S. C., & Karchmer, M. A. (1987). Who will be served? *Gallaudet Today, 18*(Fall), 4-21.

Bunch, G. O. (1987). *The curriculum and the hearing-impaired student: Theoretical and practical considerations.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company.

Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf. (1967). *Standards for library-media centers in schools for the deaf: A handbook for the development of library-media programs.* Washington, DC: HEW, Office of Education, Captioned Films for the Deaf.

Cory, P. B. (1967). Report on library programs in schools for the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf, 112*(5), 701-711.

Darling, R. L. (1967). Implementing the media program in schools for the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf, 112*(5), 712-718.

Fast, E. T. (1976). Standards of excellence in hard times. *School Media Quarterly, 4*(2), 121-125.

Hannigan, J. A. (1982). School media standards. *Library Trends, 31*(1), 49-63.

Henne, F. (1972). Standards for media programs in schools. *Library Trends, 21*(2), 233-247.

Hug, W. E. (1989). Developing school library media standards. In J. B. Smith (Ed.), *School library media annual* (Vol. 7, pp. 37-45). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Jones, M. L. (1982). School library media standards: Changing to suit the times. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 16*(1), 13-18.

Lancaster, F. W. (1977). *The measurement and evaluation of library services.* Washington, DC: Information Resources Press.

Liesener, J. W. (1989). Information power: A broader perspective. In J. B. Smith (Ed.), *School library media annual* (Vol. 7, pp. 25-36). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Lucas, L., & Karrenbrock, M. H. (1983). *The disabled child in the library: Moving into the mainstream*. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Moores, D. F. (1987). *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles, and practices* (3d ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Moores, D. F. (1991). The great debates: Where, how and what to teach deaf children. *American Annals of the Deaf, 136*(1), 35-37.

National Education Association & American Library Association Joint Committee. (1925). *Elementary school library standards*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

National Education Association & North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Committee on Library Organization and Equipment. (1920). *Standard library organization and equipment for secondary schools of different sizes*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Pendell, L. H. (1971). Library service to the deaf. In A. Kent & H. Lancour (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of library and information science* (Vol. 6, pp. 444-467). New York: M. Dekker.

Ploch, R. A. (1972). A model for library standards. In I. B. Hoadley & A. S. Clark (Eds.), *Quantitative methods in librarianship: Standards, research, management* (pp. 66-68). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Prine, S., & Wright, K. C. (1982). Standards for the visually and hearing impaired. *Library Trends, 31*(1), 93-108.

Schildroth, A. N., & Hotto, S. A. (1991). Annual survey of hearing impaired children and youth: 1989-90 school year. *American Annals of the Deaf, 136*(2), 155-164.

Sullivan, P. (1967). The idea of the school library and communication. *American Annals of the Deaf, 112*(5), 688-692.

Wallace, J. O. (1972a). The practical meaning of library standards. In I. B. Hoadley & A. S. Clark (Eds.), *Quantitative methods in librarianship: Standards, research, management* (pp. 31-38). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Wallace, J. O. (1972b). History and philosophy of library standards. In I. B. Hoadley & A. S. Clark (Eds.), *Quantitative methods in librarianship: Standards, research, management* (pp. 39-56). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Wright, K. C., & Davie, J. F. (1989). *Library and information services for handicapped individuals* (3d ed.). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.