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Abstract

The setting for this study was the J.A. Turner Professional Library which is the central corporate Professional Library for the Peel Board of Education which is the largest Public School Board in Canada. The library also provides library services for educators in graduate programs at Brock University, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, York University, and the Faculty of Education University of Toronto to support their professional development and continuing education needs. The focus for the study were the Peel and Brock consumer groups so as to allow for comparisons. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the services and resources of the J.A. Turner Professional Library by ascertaining the views and opinions of two consumer groups of the Professional Library at the Peel Board of Education. The author initiated the evaluation for several reasons including: her belief that the library as a service component of the organization must ensure that its objectives fit the organizational culture and as the Peel Board was committed to organizational renewal i.e., strategic planning so was the library. The sample consisted of library users drawn from two consumer groups of which there were 127 Peel and 50 Brock users, and 32 Peel and three Brock stakeholders. The data collection consisted of a self-reporting questionnaire and selected interviews. For the purpose of analysis the responses were divided into the following two groups Peel Board of Education and Brock users. The results indicate that there is a high level of support for the J.A. Turner Professional Library. The interviews provided future directions for the development of the J.A. Turner Professional Library. The study closes with a series of recommendations to enhance the operation of the J.A. Turner Professional Library within the organizational context of the Peel Board of Education.

INTRODUCTION

First let us recall that the purpose of this study was to evaluate the services and resources of the J.A. Turner Professional Library by ascertaining the views and opinions of two consumer groups: The Brock and Peel users and stakeholders to allow for comparison. The article titled Part I: Services of the Central Education Library of the Peel Board of Education serving graduates at Brock University and the Extension Campus of the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: A Survey presented this study and was published in the March 1992 issue of Education Libraries. It presented the general research questions, Review of the Literature, Methodology, Data Analysis, and the Results of the self-reporting questionnaires. The focus for Part II of this article will be to present the Results of the interview data, the summary and discussion of the entire study and the recommendations.

DATA ANALYSIS: QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW DATA

A Word of Caution

Owing to the subjective nature of interview data one must consider the context of the organization, the setting and purpose of the study all of which are described in Part One of this article. However, the analysis technique defined by Glaser & Strauss (1967) and applied by the author—grounded theory building allow for the “telling of the story” which may be of interest to readers.

Data Analysis

The interview data was coded and summarized by the principal investigator. The interview data which was analyzed included transcriptions of the interviews of the stakeholders who were interviewed. The stakeholders as described earlier fall into three groups that are not mutually exclusive. These three groups include: Peel Board Senior Administration and Superintendents, Program Department Co-ordinators, and Brock full-time faculty all of whom utilize the library.

The analyst utilized the grounded theory building methodology of Glaser and Strauss (1967) to analyse the qualitative interview data. Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) methodology called for joint coding and analysis in a systematic approach which also utilizes theoretical sampling.

This methodology allows for creative generating of theory. It is known as the Constant Comparative Method and includes the following four steps:

1) comparing incidents applicable to each category
2) integrating categories and their properties
3) delimitating the theory
4) writing the theory.

Constant comparison following Glaser and Strauss (1967), generated theoretical properties or components for each category of analysis. Each of the three groups of interviewees, i.e. Peel
Senior Administration and Superintendents, Program Department Co-ordinators, and Brock full-time faculty were analyzed as a broad category following from comparison of the data, and the instrument for data collection (i.e. interview schedule) further categories and components or properties for comparison were generated. The data from each interview group was analyzed distinctly according to the theoretical sampling process, however, the categories for comparison were the same for each group. These results were summarized in commentary form which was compared further for reduction as the analyst expected to uncover underlying uniformities. The results from the groups were then compared for thematic similarities and dissimilarities.

INSTRUMENTATION

Stakeholders - Interview Schedule
The major themes (services, resources, accessibility) contained in the questionnaire have been formatted for the group of stakeholders and are presented in Appendix A. The interviewees were asked to rate the same services and resources as appear in the questionnaire. The principal investigator handed each interviewee the chart with the categories and examples of services and resources. It is intended that this will promote discussion, and educate the stakeholder regarding the themes as they generally are unaware of the complexities of the library because they receive full service without utilizing each of the areas themselves.

The interviewees were asked to comment on what they see as the future role of the J.A. Turner Professional Library in the Board and the future role of libraries in society at large.

DATA COLLECTION

Stakeholders
Each of the stakeholders was interviewed on site at the H.J.A. Brown Education Centre at their convenience. Letters of introduction and thank you were sent.

Results - Qualitative Interviews Data
In this section a summary of the interviews is presented. The interviews were analyzed using a distinct set of categories which included the following:

- Utilization
- Most beneficial services
- Components
  - ratings of services
  - ratings of resources
- Areas for improvement
- Components
  - specific services
  - specific resources
- Future role of the library
- Future role of libraries in society

In addition, the interviews were analyzed individually for the following three groups:

Group 1 - Peel Senior Administration and Superintendents
Group 2 - Peel Program Co-ordinators
Group 3 - Brock full-time faculty

Results for Category 1 - Utilization
The process of comparative analysis requires that the analyst break down the story for clear integration of the theory. Throughout the results there are quotations from the data provided as illustrations that tell the story.

In terms of Utilization, the Peel senior administration and superintendents most frequently identified using the literature search services and resultant journal articles in order to "broaden their thinking" or "expand knowledge" or "blend experience and research". Some individuals cited using this information for committee investigation, speeches, presentation, and keeping current.

The Program Department co-ordinators most frequently identified using the library for a variety of reasons including: the literature search services, to maintain current awareness in terms of educational issues, trends and research, send writing teams, and introduce resource staff.

The Brock full-time faculty utilized the library primarily to introduce and encourage their students to support their own Graduate level educational research. The faculty themselves sited the access to the journal collection as one reason for using the library.

Results for Category 2 - Most Beneficial Services
When asked to identify their most beneficial services or experiences with the library, the Peel senior administration and superintendents generally identified the search services. In fact, individuals often restated their reasons categorized under utilization for using the library. The Program Department co-ordinators specifically identified the search services, the personalized contact, the availability of journal articles, and proximity for browsing the library collections. Individuals cited search success stories, e.g., retrieval of materials to preview regarding Black studies, transition years, school organization, and site-based management.

The Brock full-time faculty identified staff assistance for locating specific materials pertaining to a topic, library orientation for graduate students, and the extended hours as their most beneficial services.

Comparison of the Results for Category 1 and 2
It is beneficial to compare the results of the three groups now utilizing theoretical sampling while looking for similarities and dissimilarities. Glaser and Strauss (1967) maintain that this constant comparison will yield a more integrated theory.

Similarities
The comparison generated the following theory. In each of the groups of stakeholders’ results, the information reported re-
Results for Category 1 - Reasons

Components - General Reasons

The first two groups, i.e. Peel Stakeholders - Senior Administration and Superintendents, and Program Department Co-ordinators utilize the library for similar reasons relating to specific services, although the co-ordinators as a group report more specifically about how they use the library in terms of specific reasons or components of services. Generally speaking, these groups use the library as a “special library” serving needs within the organization.

Dissimilarities

The Brock full-time faculty utilize the library for access to library collections and promotes its availability to their students for their own academic investigations. Generally, this groups utilizes the library as an academic library to support graduate level research.

Results for Category 2 - Resources

Components - Specific Services

The Peel Stakeholder groups of interviewees utilize the library to provide service they expect the library to have resources but, they were not too aware of the specific resources.

The Program Department co-ordinators and Brock full-time faculty rate the library services highly and commented positively about the amount of information accessible through the J.A. Turner Professional Library.

Components - Specific Resources

To gather this information each interviewer was handed a list of specific resources and asked to rate the ones that they utilized.

The Peel senior administration and superintendents rated the resources favourably and thoroughly. They rated the recent acquisitions and book collection least favourably. Comments were made in the interviews indicating that they understood our fiscal reality; however, they still believed that the library needed more current resources in terms of books for a Board as large as Peel.

The Brock full-time faculty rated the resources highly.

Comparison of the Results for the Ratings

The results for the ratings of services and resources have been compared as a whole owing to the intrinsic or integrated nature of these two components of the library role.

Similarities

The Peel senior administration and superintendents, Program Department co-ordinators and Brock full-time faculty rate the services and resources that they utilize favourably. Both of these groups use the library as a special library meeting their needs within an organizational context.

Dissimilarities

The Program Department co-ordinators provide more specific ratings of resources than do the Peel senior administration and superintendents. The comments from Brock full-time faculty are general with regard to the specific resources and services. They tend to utilize the library for academic research and require a breadth of resources and availability of information which they are satisfied within the J.A. Turner Professional Library.

Category 4 - Areas for Improvement

Each of the interviewees was asked what services and resources of the library they would like to see improved or enhanced. The responses yielded a wealth of information for constant comparison which merited application of theoretical sampling and the researcher was able to reduce the findings to common themes and then to substantive theory in relationship to areas for improvement. In the process of reduction the services and resources data was compiled into this category following the author’s premise that the integrated nature of these components
is fundamental to the nature of libraries. The comparative analysis revealed four common themes: individualized information needs, library informational tools, communications aspects, and collection development, which will be utilized for discussion for each of the three groups of stakeholders’ responses.

The Peel senior administration and superintendents talked about their need for more individualized services such as monthly searches on a topic, summaries or reviews of current educational issues. In general they described this as a need for more direct, or pro-active services from the library. The Superintendents in particular requested that they be targeted on an individual basis for services and as a group of decision-makers. For example, “synthesis of recent reports and reviews of books”, were suggested by one Superintendent, and others indicated interest in having searches performed regularly on specific topics e.g., alternatives to suspension, renewal of 7, 8, and 9, and active learning.

The second theme related to their request for some informational library tools such as: a periodicals list, a recent acquisitions list and a list of services. The superintendents of schools identified these types of tools as being useful for their personal information and to promote the J.A. Turner Professional Library services and resources to their clients who are principals and vice-principals of families of schools. One superintendent of schools was interested in taking the services and resources rating form to his constituents as an example and was pleased to receive our current list of services for dissemination.

The third theme that emerged from the data was that the library should take advantage of some of the Board’s communications mechanisms e.g., publications and professional networks to promote its services. In the perception of the Senior Administration they would like to see more people in the library. Superintendents identified greater utilization of the Communications Departments publications such as, Synergy and P.S., and greater networking with the administrators’, and teacher-librarians’ association as a means to promote services and provide equitable service throughout Peel. The Senior Administration recommended that the library publish “success stories” in the Peel newsletters Synergy and P.S. as a means of heightening system awareness and providing examples for modelling.

The fourth and final theme that emerged was in relation to the improvement of resources. The senior administration and superintendents recommended that the Professional Library maintain its research library orientation and focus its collection development on themes from Board initiatives, i.e. active learning, leadership development, corporate renewal and coping with change, specifically were cited. This group also requested that the library look into the acquisition of a greater variety of media, i.e. auto tapes were mentioned for listening while travelling “to and for” Peel. As one Superintendent stated it “The Professional Library needs to be seen as a system partner.”

The first theme the Program Department co-ordinators talked about related to their needs for more individualized search services “for credence and corroboration”, i.e. to be kept current with regard to educational issues in the literature that relate to their Board portfolios. A number of co-ordinators cited specific topics for individualized search services e.g. renewal 7, 8, and 9, generic skills, technology in education. Several Co-ordinators requested that a streamlined version of “Contents” be provided as they missed being able to browse their favorite journals on a regular basis. Another co-ordinator suggested that the library set-up a directory along the concept of a “Peel Network” to identify active committees etc. on particular topics. Several co-ordinators wanted to “read what the senior administration and superintendents read!”

The terms of the second theme: library informational tools; the Program Department co-ordinators recommended that the library produce a list of recent acquisitions.

With regard to enhanced utilization of communications mechanisms, the third theme, the Program Department co-ordinators stressed the need for a more effective curriculum distribution system. They acknowledged that given our current restraints the library was doing well as could be expected however they believe curriculum distribution to be critical for the system’s teachers. There was some controversy here as to whether this was or should be a professional library function. A number of co-ordinators believed that if the library was to provide information services then curriculum distribution was one of those services. There was recognition that the library could provide a bibliographic standard for the curricular materials. Several co-ordinators identified concerns regarding centralized curriculum distribution and the Boards' move to a decentralized model for delivery of service. One co-ordinator believed that technology would rectify this paradox once we moved to electronic distribution of documents which they defined as a decentralized model. With regard to the fourth theme which relates the improvement of resources, the co-ordinators stressed the need for “recent acquisitions” and “books” frequently, and recommended areas for collection development e.g., educational and professional leadership, corporate renewal, more British, European, and Australian Educational Journals, and the Encyclopedia of Education. The recommendations were plentiful and specific, but thematically consistent, as they indicate that we need to develop collections to support Board initiatives and educational trends with a focus on research.

In terms of areas for improvement the Brock full-time faculty commented only on a need for collection development in the area of educational research, theory and administration classics. One faculty member mentioned that access to an SPSS workstation in the library for graduate students doing data analysis would be beneficial.

Comparisons of the Areas for Improvement

Similarities. The Peel senior administration, superintendents and Program co-ordinators comments focus on the four emergent themes:

1. need for more individualized information services - synthesis and analysis
2. need for utilization of Board communications mechanisms to promote service
3. need for more library informational tools
4. need for collection development to focus on Board themes
The Brock full-time faculty’s comments only pertain to the fourth theme.

**Dissimilarities.** The Peel senior administration and superintendents commented from two perspectives, as users, and as perceptors of the systems’ Professional Library informational needs. The Program Department co-ordinators commented as users. Their comments were detailed with regard to specific areas for improvement in terms of services and resources and often described in detail “a new way to provide information services”. The co-ordinators’ comments often related to appreciating availability and proximity of the Professional Library. The Brock full-time faculty did not comment a lot with regard to areas for improvement.

The comments for all stakeholders with regard to areas for improvement in terms of services and resources are generally expanded dialogue and conceptual discussion flowing from the process of rating specific services and resources. The rating process appears to have served its purpose of stimulating discussion.

**Results of Category 5 - The Future Role of the J.A. Turner Professional Library**

With regard to the future role of the J.A. Turner Professional Library, the interviewees comments fall into common themes such as:

- develop a broader role in the organization in terms of access to information relating to Board current and historical information,
- develop/continue greater integration in the organization as an information resources research centre,
- continue greater utilization of technology,
- expand greater linkage with external educational organizations.

These themes will be utilized to report the results for this category. The Senior Administration and Superintendents suggested that in the future the role of the J.A. Turner Professional Library may become (more) coordinated with the Research & Development Department to provide electronic access to Board information as well as for research and professional literature. However, one Superintendent succinctly qualified the future developments stressing that the library will develop and renew with the organization in our current context which includes fiscal constraints. Now is the time to consolidate services and resources while remaining supportive of the decision makers information needs. Several Superintendents suggested that the future will require “thematic building” of library collections which will promote greater involvement in the organization. The senior administration and superintendents suggested that future will require the library to continue to utilize technology to deliver services. Ultimately, this will change work and the way in which we interact as an organization and as individuals. Greater utilization of technology may provide a more effective means to provide, promote and delivery library services equitably throughout the Peel Board. This group also talked about the library establishing greater linkage with external organizations specifically, the Ontario Ministry of Education was, mentioned.

The Program Department co-ordinators comments also related to the four themes. Co-ordinators suggestions for the future included access via the library to Board information, i.e. current reports and historical. One Co-ordinator indicated that he perceived peer and system hesitancy to access this information from the Director’s Office as the library is a “place to research and study.” Co-ordinators also spoke of the library becoming the centre for information in the Board specifically a “hub of information.” Co-ordinators, in trying to wrestle with the curriculum distribution situation suggest electronic dissemination of information to the system in a variety of accessible formats, i.e. curriculum on CD-ROM and “journal contents” browsing from their workstations. They see a decentralized model for delivery of service. Co-ordinators also wondered if the Peel Board of Education Professional Library could partner with the Dufferin Peel Separate School Board Professional Library.

With regard to the future, the Brock full-time faculty would like to continue the satellite relationship with the library. They value the availability of the collections. They would like to continue to support distance education by providing access to the J.A. Turner Professional Library.

**Comparisons of Results**

**Similarities.** For each of the three groups of stakeholders the suggestions with regard to areas for improvement point to the future role of the J.A. Turner Professional Library.

**Results of Category 6 - The Role of Libraries in Our Society at Large**

The comments were very global in nature from each of the groups of stakeholders. The common theme that emerged was that stakeholders value libraries for emotional, social, and intellectual reasons. They believe that libraries’ roles will expand with greater utilization of technology and multi-media collections. Libraries are viewed as information centres for the public at large and foster literacy in our society.

**SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION**

Recall that the purpose of this study was to evaluate the services and resources of the J.A. Turner Professional Library by ascertaining the views and opinions of two consumer groups namely the stakeholders and the users. The focus for the study were the Peel and Brock consumer groups so as to allow for comparisons. Overall the general findings indicate that there is a high level of overall satisfaction with the services and resources provided by the J.A. Turner Professional Library for the library users in all groups. Each of the user groups indicated that the most frequently utilized services are the search services and of next importance are the document delivery services. The staff assistance in the library was also rated highly. There were many
positive comments evident in the open-ended responses of the surveys, and, in the interviews, staff assistance was commended consistently. Suffice it to say there is a high level of satisfaction with the services and resources provided by the library in terms of the status quo.

In terms of specific services and resources the rating questions provided the users and stakeholders with specific categories to rate in terms of usefulness. The detailed nature of this rating inventory that was presented was intended to elicit a detailed picture of the types of services and resources user and stakeholders found useful while giving them an educational overview of what was available. The design of the question proved effective because the users responded to these questions with a high degree of validity, and there responses were congruent with the responses from the interviewees. The stakeholders answered these two questions with lesser detail in part owing to the direct way they utilize the library for “results - oriented services” by their own submission, as opposed to users who follow a “search - oriented approach” to gather their information in the library.

However, it is important to recall that the stakeholders were given the opportunity in the next question to comment with regard to areas for improvement and this is where the detail was given pertaining to specific services and resources. The ratings question allowed for the conceptual comments to be focused on specifics. The results of the question with regard to access for improvement are fertile and the following four themes emerged:

• more individualized services (filtering, analysis and synthesis of information)
• more library informational tools (output-direct proactive)
• more exposure of the library in Board communications mechanisms
• more thematic resources - collection development related to Board initiatives.

Looking back to the survey results there was a demand for expanded library services and expanded books and recent acquisitions.

It is important to discuss each of the four themes that emerged in their intended context in order that recommendations be defined that meet the needs of the organization. It is likely that these four themes will lay the foundation for the future.

First, the stakeholders comments focused on their needs for more individualized services. They cited specific types of needs in terms of topics of interest and suggested methods to provide this individualized service. However, it is my belief that they are really asking for specialized assistance in terms of filtering, (synthesis and analysis) the vast amounts of information they receive. The organization is experiencing tremendous change, as is our evolving information society. In these tumultuous times, the stakeholders have a voracious need for information as decision-makers. This information must be relevant, timely and related to the Peel Board’s context to effectively support the decision makers. It is no longer enough to provide access to information, libraries must interpret needs and provide relevant, timely contextual information.

Secondly, stakeholders suggested that the library produce more informational tools such as: a list of periodicals and a recent acquisitions list. These tools are most useful for reference in the library. However, the stakeholders likely perceive that these tools become a marketing tool that informs and heightens system awareness with regard to what is available in the Professional Library.

Third, the stakeholders recommended that the library utilize Board communications mechanisms to promote its services throughout the system. It was suggested that professional networks and Board publications be utilized.

The last theme that emerged was in regard to resources building. The intention here was that the library develop its collections to support Board initiatives and some specific examples were given. It should be noted that there was interest in fostering a multi-media approach to the Professional collections. The library would necessarily maintain its research-oriented foundation.

The themes that emerged with regard to areas for improvement provide a direction for the future role of the J.A. Turner Professional Library. The comments of the stakeholders with regard to the future role of the library are global in scope and generally recommended that they would like to see the library become institutionalized in the organization. Many suggestions are given with regard to “how to” accomplish this, i.e. continue to utilize technology with a focus on delivery of services, raise system awareness regarding the scope of services available, continue to develop systems for access to information with a emphasis on Board information (historical and current), and expand external relationships with educational organizations.

It is important to be cognizant of the social and economic context of the organization and commit to a congruent direction for the future role of the J.A. Turner Professional Library in the Peel Board of Education, Russell (1990) and Stufflebeam (1971). The recommendations are statements of direction to initially improve the J.A. Turner Professional Library in terms of services and resources and areas for its future development. The recommendations will only be accomplished if there is organizational support.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and summary the following recommendations are presented:

• A Professional Library Advisory Committee be formed (PLAC) as a forum for discussion, and planning to ensure that the library’s objectives are congruent with the organization. The library advisory committee members will be from every sector of the organization and will have an advocacy role to play within the organization
• To initiate the committee the library will present its collection development policy for discussion by the PLAC. As required, topics relating to library policy will be presented to PLAC for discussion.
• The Professional Library in conjunction with Computer Services will continue to integrate technology to expedite the delivery of information services. Areas for specific investigation include integrated library systems.
• The library in co-ordination with Research and Development and Computer Services will continue to explore development of an information management retrieval system for Board related information.
• In order to garner commitment and corporate sponsorship of the library. The senior administration and superintendents will be invited:
  - to review books newly acquisitioned by the library. The reviews will be published by the library giving credit to the reviewers for distribution to system partners.
  - to prepare annotated bibliographies on topics relevant to Board initiatives with the assistance of the Professional Library. The library will conduct searches and retrieve materials for annotation as required and publish the annotated bibliography for distribution to the system partners.
• The Professional Library will explore its potential involvement in cooperative education programs in accordance with the Peel Board of Education operating policy.
• The library will distribute its periodicals list and recent acquisitions list annually on a systemwide basis.
• Professional Library informational tools will be announced in P.S. and Synergy.

APPENDIX A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.A. TURNER PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990 USER SURVEY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: ________________________________
Position: ____________________________
Date of Interview: ____________________
Location: ____________________________

1. How do you utilize the J.A. Turner Professional Library?

   ____________________________________________________________________________

Cues for interviewer if required: 1 - Professional Development; 2 - Browsing/current awareness; 3 - Policy Formulation; 4 - Send students/staff; 5 - Committee work; 6 - Research; 7 - Read Newspapers

2. Please describe the three most positive/beneficial services you have received from the J.A. Turner Professional Library?

   ____________________________________________________________________________

3. Please rate in your opinion the usefulness of the following resources/services.

   ____________________________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________________________

                                    HAND SHEET TO INTERVIEWEE
Please rate your assessment/evaluation of the various services provided by the J.A. Turner Professional Library. Please circle NA if you are unsure or have not used the services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Services</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Strategy Design</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational literature searches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current awareness searches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject specific literature searches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Delivery Services</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC document acquisition</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article acquisition</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Assistance</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature search strategy design</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval of in-house items</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval of external information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Orientation</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Public Access Catalogue</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD ROM ERIC</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Services</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copyright clearance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum distribution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. As the Peel Board of Education moves into a period of renewal what services would you like to see improved in the Professional Library?

________________________________________________________________________

5. As the Peel Board of Education moves into a period of renewal what resources would you like to see improved in the Professional Library?

________________________________________________________________________

6. What do you see as the future of the J.A. Turner Professional Library in the Peel Board of Education?

________________________________________________________________________
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At the Division’s business meeting that year, the members voted unanimously to have Education Libraries published separately and available by subscription only. A new Division publication, The Bulletin, would be sent free to members twice a year and would contain news about activities and events of importance to them. Thus began the custom of having two publications for the Division.

The 70th SLA annual conference was held in Honolulu in June 1979. Pauline Rothstein was installed as division chairperson, Charles Missar was chosen as chair-elect and James Bradley of the Community College of Philadelphia was elected secretary-treasurer. There was a co-sponsored program on “Multilingualistics/Multi-Culturalism” and a program featuring Professor Pauline Atherton of Syracuse University. Jane Westenberger from Virginia Commonwealth University and Suzanne Wise from Appalachian State University became the new Bulletin editors.

The 71st annual conference was held in Washington, D.C. in June 1980. Pauline Rothstein arranged a panel discussion on the dissemination programs of the U.S. National Institute of Education. There was a tour of the United States Educational Research Library. At the annual business meeting it was announced that Guest Perry and Malcolm Hamilton were stepping down as editors of Education Libraries. They were each presented with gold pens “in recognition of their pioneering efforts and total dedication to the Division.” Susan Baughman of the Gutman Library at Harvard University was introduced as the new editor. Charles Missar took over the chair and Judy Segal of the Bibliographical Center for Research was chosen chair-elect.

The Division had matured after several years of rapid growth and development. Those who had the vision and vitality to bring all this about were passing on the responsibilities to others. New persons were taking over as officers, editors and active members to carry forward this work. The bylaws and mission were in place. Competent members were stepping forward to serve in various roles. The publications program was on course. Program planning was challenging and innovative. Everything was ready for the Division to move forward. Let the ’80s begin!

Charles D. Missar, retired from the U.S. Department of Education Library, is a partner in Missar Associates, and two-time past-Chair of the Education Division.