Curriculum Resources:
More Than the Sum of Books and A-V

by Ken Haycock

Abstract
Some would suggest that the "marriage" of library and audio-visual services has not been successful and that the promise of **Resource Services for Canadian Schools** has not been realized. While the integration of services has not resulted in a new paradigm for services, there has been good progress in schools, often in spite of weak professional preparation for these positions through university training and inadequate leadership at the district level. Some significant issues are identified which require addressing before further progress is possible.

Introduction

When I was asked to address the issue of the failed marriage of school libraries and educational media for this special issue of CJEC, I couldn't help but wonder if this was still an issue, and if so why? Is the integration of "library" and "av" the myth that it is sometimes made out to be? Is current reality closer to the means and methods we preferred in the 1960s rather than the 1980s? Are we really making very little progress in entering the educational mainstream as a unified approach to learning resources, undergirding the educational enterprise?

I have perhaps a rather simplistic view of the place of curriculum resources in the teaching/learning process. It seems

Ken Haycock is acting manager of elementary/ secondary education for the Vancouver School Board, British Columbia, with responsibilities for working with district staff to develop and deliver curriculum and professional development programs for 3,000 teachers and administrators. He was previously coordinator of library services and supervisor of instruction K-12 for the board's 110 school resource centers and district services. Mr. Haycock is past president of both the Canadian School Library Association and the Canadian Library Association.

reasonable to me that each school should have a centralized collection of learning materials, including books, periodicals, maps and other print materials as well as filmstrips, slides, recordings and other audiovisual materials. One would hope that this collection would be selected using accepted criteria for excellence and appropriateness and would be organized for effective use by teachers and students.

This scenario is not at all unrealistic; indeed, without debating the quality of selection and organization of materials in individual locations, this is the case in almost every school in the country. In some jurisdictions these collections are called school libraries, in others school resource centres. These are firmly entrenched in educational thinking and programs as a "good thing".

It further seems reasonable that each school would have a professional teacher in charge of the maintenance and effective exploitation of this collection. Presumably, should logic prevail, this individual would have additional qualifications in the essential areas of administration, selection, organization and effective use of learning resources, recognizing that courses in such subjects are fairly readily available and do add to qualifications for salary purposes. For effective use to take place, we know that this teacher will plan programs with classroom colleagues which integrate the skills necessary for students to handle information logically and rationally, particularly in those essential areas of processing and using information. This resource-based learning is effective for a number of reasons: there is clarity of communication between the teaching partners; skills are clearly specified for teaching and evaluation; the subject context and classroom framework are obvious to the student; two teachers and selected resources are available to the same group of youngsters.

For whatever reasons, however, this personnel factor has not entered that mainstream of educational thinking in some parts of the country. Most schools do have the collections and facilities;

some have staff to manage the collection; fewer have professional staff to ensure that the collection is used; still fewer have the qualified professional staff trained in this exploitation; and still fewer again have the qualified professional staff, by whatever definition, who are committed to effective use through integration with instructional programs and cooperative program planning and team teaching.

It is now a full decade since the national review of the direction of library and media services which resulted in **Resource Services for Canadian Schools.** I recall quite clearly the anticipation and hope surrounding a new paradigm of resource-based learning, not only integrating library and audio-visual services but in fact creating a better approach to leadership in the selection and use of learning resources in the school. The personnel recommended for the school resource centre included a learning resource teacher who would work logically, effectively and persistently toward these ideals. There was even serious discussion at the time of calling this individual an "animature" to further define expectations for change.

Where did we go wrong?

What is the Problem?

Has there really been an unhappy marriage of school libraries and educational media? I think not. The school library, or more appropriately resource centre, is a place which houses educational media, including print and audio-visual materials. Few libraries include only printed materials yet stereotypes persist that libraries are for books. Perhaps the marriage is secure but the offspring not yet produced; the offspring being that new paradigm or philosophical construct of the place of resource-based learning in the school and the role of the teacher-librarian (or learning resource teacher, if you will) in fostering it.

Terminology

The common link between school library specialists and audio-visual specialists is of course teaching and learning; this link is even more obvious between members of either group and their classroom colleagues. Why then do we alienate ourselves and our services from this mainstream by creating barriers through jargon? Perhaps "learning resource teacher "was too advanced for its time and was confused with special education teachers in some jurisdictions. "Teacher-librarian", the CSLA term

adopted in 1982, does at least include reference to the teaching component; but why "librarian" when referring to the innovative, effective teacher? Why "library" when referring to the school's collection of learning resources, particularly when many have their own vision of a library from experiences outside of schools? Why "library skills" when "information skills" designate more clearly the function envisioned?

Qualifications

The policy statement of the Canadian School Library Association on **Qualifications for Teacher-Librarians** includes nine areas of competence. Throughout the document the terms "learning materials" and "learning resources" are used, yet in the reactions from leaders in instructional technology the proposed policy was consistently termed book-oriented and library-oriented. The only rationalization for this problem was the rather obvious bias with which the document was being read (if it's coming from the CSLA insert "book" whenever you see "learning resources"). Another example, from leaders in both sectors, pointed to the lack of mention of newer technologies and how terribly backward this was, yet the document does not say that information is to be organized manually, or that information retrieval is to be limited to printed pages. We all have our biases and we recognize this, but occasionally we don't see as clearly or as objectively as we might, due to these ingrown layers of interpretation.

The policy statement does specifically point to the need for competence in the following nine areas:

* administration of the learning resource program
* selection of learning resources
* acquisition, organization and circulation of learning resources
* reading, listening and viewing guidance
* design and production of learning resources
* information and reference services
* promotion of the effective use of learning resources and services
* cooperative program planning and teaching
* professionalism and leadership

These areas were defined following considerable consultation with leaders in the field. There would appear to be no issue with the areas outlined. One need ask then if these areas are being developed in the programs which educate teacher-

librarians and learning resource specialists.

When integration of materials and services is so prevalent at the school level why is it so singularly lacking at the university level? Can we say with confidence that graduates of these programs can articulate information skills, including critical listening and viewing skills, in a developmental continuum, and that they not only understand the need for working with classroom teachers, but also have the skills necessary to develop foundations for program development and strategies for effective team planning and teaching? Decidedly not.

What kinds of experiences are being provided to candidates in these programs to ensure a common philosophy and the strategies for developing an integrated learning resources program? And, if the universities aren't providing adequate professional preparation, is the district committed to staff development programs to compensate for this?

This issue becomes even more prevalent at the district level with program leaders who may share a background in teaching but have significantly different professional educations in teacher-librarianship and audio-visual services, resulting in different professional socialization, associations and networks.

District Networks

Major issues in approaches to service which occur in systems with separate library and audio-visual services can almost invariably be traced to the way in which the system is viewed. Are district services designed to support, connect and enhance the school resource centres in the district or are district services designed to serve individuals in schools directly? Too many district resource centres, and their coordinators, still focus on differences in philosophy and approach of teacher-librarians and audio-visual specialists while refusing to draw those centres and that personnel into a cohesive, unified system which recognizes differences but supports programs with the best that the total system has to offer. Teachers should be able to look to their school resource centre to serve needs, recognizing that that centre fits into a larger system in a planned, efficient way.

Medium or Message?

I suppose there are still those who focus on the medium, whether it be microcom-

puter software, films or children's books, rather than the appropriateness of the medium for the specific needs of the teacher/learning design. And there are those who are "married" to one medium without recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of each and their often unique purpose. This, it seems to me, has less to do with a preference for children's literature or video production than a sadly lacking understanding of the components for effective program development and the cohesion necessary to foster a school-based approach to information handling, which not only recognizes, but also takes into account, different learning styles to attain the same objectives.

Whose Skills? Whose Program?

Teacher-librarians are focusing more and more on information skills and their place in the curriculum. There is no question, however, that the skills of effective listening and viewing are not being addressed in proportion to their significance. More support is needed here from university faculty and district coordinators, not in terms of teaching packages for classrooms but rather in developing the ability of the teacher-librarian to work with colleagues with the object of integrating these various skills into instructional programs. Again, ignorance of the abilities and skills necessary to foster a program, or alternately, recognition of these needs as a priority, are equally applicable, regardless of medium preference.

New Technology

Perhaps the differences among learning resource personnel are becoming more apparent as opportunities exist for the extremists to make their case for or against microcomputers. The "bookies" play hard to get and hard to find in developing their own computer competence (let alone leadership), while the "hackers" merrily forget all else in order to gaze fondly at the equipment and develop computer programs. These are extremes to be sure, but at the school level at least we need more professionals who are comfortable with new opportunities, but who also recognize both the potential and the pitfalls of current applications of new technology for administration and instruction.

Conclusion

While it is feasible to sit around and

CURRICULUM RESOURCES

debate the issue of school libraries and educational media, such a discussion trivializes the major issues. While we bemoan the lack of integration of different types of learning resources, particularly into effective programs, we focus too on the media and their collection and organization. In an information society more time and energy has to be devoted to national debate on using the resources we have available to us in effective instructional programs to teach youngsters how to process and use information.

To do that, we go right back to the promise of **Resource Services for Canadian Schools**. We need a clear aim for the program, a role for professional personnel which is clarified and focused, good programs to prepare this staff, a district approach to coordination of resource centres and their development in a unified system, staff development programs which focus on program development and enhancement, and a commitment to well-designed, well-integrated resource based learning programs for young people. This is really the least we can do with any degree of professional competence and respect.

MISSION POSSIBLE

The standards contain both quantitative and qualitative statements, and "represent a compromise between 'what should be' as expressed in the literature and 'what is realistically attainable' in the present economic climate." It is intended that they be interpreted as minimum rather than desirable expectations.

The inclusion of quantitative standards for school library collections, staffing and facilities is always controversial. At once they are seen by schools exceeding them as too low, and by those at the other end of the spectrum as impossible to attain. According to responses to the questionnaire, about 36 percent of the school jurisdictions would have some difficulty phasing in the standards over a 3-5 year period.

Following are the standards for library staff and the school library collection.

Library Staff

1. Professional direction is critical to the development and implementation of an effective program.

Professional direction may be provided through a variety of alternatives:
a) By a full-time teacher-librarian on the school staff.
b) By a teacher-librarian with a part-time library and part-time teaching assignment.
c) By a teacher-librarian serving more than one school in the district.
d) By supervision by a school district (central office) teacher-librarian.
e) By cooperative agreement with a regional library system.
f) Where no teacher-librarian is available, by the principal and teaching staff of the school.

Note: i) The minimum qualifications of a teacher-librarian should include teacher certification and successful teaching experience along with university credits in at least eight half courses in librarianship and instructional technology.

ii) Active participation on the part of the principal and teachers in the implementation of the library program must increase as teacher-librarian time is decreased.

2. Qualified technical/clerical support should also be provided.

3. Professional and technical/clerical support should meet or exceed the following standards:

School Size	Teacher-Librarian	Technical/Clerical Support
150 Students	-	½ - 1
300 Students	½	½ - 1
500 Students	1	1
750 Students	1	1½ - 2
1000 Students	1	2
over 1000 Students	1½ - 2	2½ - 3

The School Library Collection

1. The basic collection should support the major content areas of the instructional program and represent a balanced range of student interests and needs, including the appreciation of literature.

2. The size of the basic collection should be dependent upon the total student enrollment served, the number of grades taught in the school, the number and types of instructional programs, and accessibility of relevant materials through regional cooperation, networking and interlibrary loan arrangements.

3. The basic library collection for a school of 250 students should include: print and nonprint materials . . . 4,000 titles
magazines . . . 20
newspapers. . . 2
pamphlets, pictures . . . to meet program needs
film/video, etc. . . from Regional Film Centre, District IMC, ACCESS (Alberta Educational Communications Corporations) etc.

Note: 1. The above represents an average basic collection for 250 students regardless of the type of school (elementary, junior or senior high). The number of course offerings in junior and senior high is offset by more grade levels served in elementary school and the need for more books at the primary school level.

2. For schools with larger enrollments, the collection should be increased to meet the needs of the students and the instructional program.

3. The ratio of fiction to nonfiction and reference should range from 15% - 30% fiction and 70% - 85% nonfiction and reference depending upon accessibility and the nature of interlibrary loans available from other school, regional, public, college and university libraries.

4. The reference collection should include at least one current general encyclopedia.

5. Schools offering programs in both English and languages other than English, should increase the basic collection to include a comparable standard of materials (print and nonprint) to support instruction in the language(s) offered.

6. Selection criteria for the library collection should be consistent with:
a) Guidelines for tolerance and understanding.
b) Controversial issues policy statement.
c) Canadian content priorities.
d) Identified library program goals and objectives.
e) Needs identified by students and teachers.
f) Information from recognized selection tools.

7. An annual school library budget should be allocated for the purchase of new materials, supplies and equipment (if equipment is not provided for in the capital budget or some other budget category). The budget should be determined on the basis of the funds required to realize library program goals and objectives. It should be recognized that smaller schools and schools offering programs in English as well as languages other than English will require a higher than average allocation.

Scene V

The Department has several activities completed or underway to provide the means for accomplishing its responsibilities.

1. A description of over 30 schools throughout the province illustrating effective library program development and implementation, **Alberta School Libraries in Action** (Alberta Education, 1984), has been distributed to all superintendents. School addresses and phone numbers are provided so that advance arrangements can be made for on-site visits.

2. A model for an integrated school library program has been developed. A description of this model will be made available to all Alberta schools, spring 1985, in the form of a monograph.

3. Throughout discussions related to the new policy, continual reference was made to the need for inservice educational programmes for teacher-librarians, teachers and administrators. In 1984, Alberta Education established a new fund for teacher inservice education in the suggested priority areas of computer literacy, gifted and talented students, and evaluations. Added to these priorities for 1985/86 is school libraries. The grants provide for $9.00 per pupil in grades one through twelve, and $5.40 per early childhood services student. The guidelines for this funding focus on activities which will result in improved classroom instruction.

4. Since 1984, a number of special needs areas have been identified by Alberta Education for additional funding. These may vary from year to year. For 1985/86, additional support will be given for the enhancement of school library learning resource collections. These funds will be allocated to school boards on the basis of $10.00 per student or $1000.00 per school which ever is greater. The funds are to be applied in addition to, not as a subsitution for, the funds normally allocated for the development of library collections. In June 1986, boards will be expected to make an interim report of the utilization and impact of this funding, with a final report in June, 1987. School boards will be required to have documents on file that are consistent with the new library policy; a plan for priority needs for collection development; and an evaluation and selection policy approved by the school board.

The 4500 responses to the questionnaire are a testimony to the commitment of Albertans to improve school library services — from the leading man, David King, Minister of Education, to the 'cast of thousands' starring the L.R.C. and provincial library association, strongly supported by parents.

Educators have given a standing ovation to the initiatives taken by Alberta Education. Curtain calls are inevitable.

REFERENCES

Alberta Education. (1984). **Alberta school libraries in action.** Edmonton, AB: Author.

Alberta Education. (1984). **Policy, guidelines, procedures and standards for school libraries in Alberta.** Edmonton, AB: Author.

STANDARDS REVISITED

Harry Newsom (from his base in Edmonton and later in Kamloops) worked with the sub-committees which were situated in Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver. Since I was located in Toronto, I related with the groups in St. Catharines, Toronto, Guelph and London. Meetings of the national committee were held in Edmonton, Winnipeg and Toronto. These had to be kept to a minimum because of the costs involved. The principal coordination of the work of the various groups in western and central Canada was achieved by frequent meetings between Harry Newsom and me. Most of these work sessions were held in Winnipeg, although some were in Toronto and Kamloops.

Neither the Canadian School Library Association nor the Educational Media Association of Canada (or its successor, the Association for Media and Technology in Education in Canada) had the financial resources to support activities on such a large scale. The preparation of the manuscript might well have been impossible had it not been for the generous grant of $12,000.00 by the World Book Encyclopedia of Chicago and Toronto. With that assistance it was possible to pay for the postage, telephone charges and travelling expenses that were necessary.

We have now come full cycle in 1985 and it is again time to consider revision of the recommendations of **Resource Services for Canadian Schools**. We have today the same two options which we had in 1971: two separate books (one each published by C.S.L.A. and A.M.T.E.C.) or a single set of standards published by the two associations jointly.

The convenience is tempting for each organization to produce a unilateral statement of the true faith from its point of view, without the bother of developing a consensus with others in the field. It would be the easier way to go and more conducive to ego trips, both corporate and personal. It would, however, be a dereliction of duty.

The dangers which we face as librarians and media specialists, we face in common. When reduced funding undermines the provision of learning materials, all are affected. The negativism of the "back to basics" revisionists makes no distinction between us. Neither books nor films are safe from witch hunts. We are attacked in common and we must defend ourselves together. Any revision or the replacement of the present standards must be a joint A.M.T.E.C. - C.S.L.A. project.

The central issue is whether we want to recommed unified standards or to retrogress to separate sets of recommendations. It is **not** whether it should be a single larger book or a series of smaller ones dealing with various particularities of recommendations. That dichotomy is a red herring. Either comprehensive or modular publications can be produced cooperatively or separately. One of our options is to publish two separate books (or, if we go the modular route, ten or twelve booklets in pairs), competing with each other for sales, subtly contradicting and lessening one another's credibility. Our other option is to develop a consensus and to speak with united conviction and doubled authority to those who need to be convinced of the importance of learning materials in all media and to be shown how to use them effectively.

The members of the Association for Media and Technology in Education in Canada and of the Canadian School Library Association have an obligation to present the case for the acquisition, production and utilization of learning materials in every medium, not competitively so as to advance the fortunes of one association at the expense of the other, but cooperatively in a bond of union, that will be, for media specialists and librarians alike, the means of obtaining better protection against common dangers and of achieving greater success in common endeavors.