

PLANNING MULTITYPE SERVICES IN A RURAL ENVIRONMENT

Annabel K. Stephens
Assistant Professor
School of Library and Information Studies
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL

and

Kathryn D. Wright
Regional Consultant for Rural Libraries
California State Library
Sacramento, CA

Introduction

In 1987-88 the researcher studied a newly-formed multitype library system in rural southeast Alabama to determine which cooperative activities to provide during the first years. The methodology worked so well that the researcher and the system's director felt it could be beneficial to other librarians' efforts. A description of the study is presented to help in planning cooperative services for both single and multitype library systems. The methodology can also be considered for the planning or needs assessment of individual libraries working with other community agencies.

Background

The fifteen county area encompassed by the new multitype library system is characterized by small and medium-sized communities in close proximity, allowing for potential cross use of libraries by residents. Cooperation among the different types of libraries had not been developed prior to 1985, when forty-one of the area's academic, special, school, and public libraries systems joined together to form a cooperative system, which became the Southeast Alabama Multitype System (SAMS).¹

In October of 1985 the District Assembly, made up of delegates representing each of the system's members, elected a Board of Trustees to develop the system. In April of 1987 a director was appointed, and the system began operation. The director decided that its members should determine the system's activities during the first phase, and the researcher, a member of the faculty at the University of Alabama's School of Library and Information Studies, was employed to assess the system's needs.

Description of Libraries

The eleven academic libraries included five four-year and three two-year state supported and three private church-related colleges. Current statistics show these libraries ranging in volumes owned from 205,357 to 16,567, with a median of 55,919 volumes. Their incomes range from \$989,227 to \$1,977 with a median income of \$227,192.

The special libraries included an Army technical and Army and Air Force community libraries, two technical college libraries, a for-profit information center, and a Department of Public Health library. Current statistics are available for only four of the special libraries; these range in volumes owned from 75,000 to 1,887, with a median of 21,598, and in income from \$220,000 to \$33,295, with a median income of \$55,919.

Three county and five city school systems and two private schools were members. Although statistics are not available, it is suspected that these school libraries, like the vast majority of school libraries in the state, are less than adequately stocked and funded.

Public library members included three non-rural city-county library systems and twenty-two rural libraries, all but one of which belong to two multi-county public library systems which are also members of SAMS. (The director of one of the rural public library systems chose to have his libraries and his system headquarters join as a unit rather than individually, so fourteen of the public libraries and one of the systems are counted as one member.)

Current statistics show the public libraries and systems ranging in population served from 215,400 to 810, with a median of 4,740; in circulation per year from 446,228 to 976, with a median of 14,378; in volumes owned from 258,671 to 2,493, with a median of 14,385; and in total yearly income from \$1,522,916 to \$1,977, with a median income of \$33,497.² In addition to the twenty-four public libraries and systems, two of the academic, two of the special, and eight of the school libraries are in rural areas of the state.³

Methodology

In addition to the diversity created by four different types of libraries ranging vastly in resources and located in both rural and non-rural areas, the researcher was faced with the challenge of assessing the needs and priorities of a group of library directors who differed vastly in formal education and professional experience. Many were unfamiliar with survey methodology and with the philosophy and rationale of multitype cooperation. Since libraries had acquired new directors in the several years during which the system was being formed, some of the directors did not really understand the cooperative system. For these reasons the researcher and the system's director visited the libraries before surveying the members. This provided an opportunity to talk with the personnel about the system's purpose, to discuss the many activities proposed, and to explain the questionnaire that would be mailed after all the visits were completed. Visits were made to thirty of the forty-one member libraries; telephone interviews were held with other directors.

The List of Activities

Before beginning the visits, the researcher and the director developed a preliminary list of possible activities with the assistance of the system's Program Planning Committee, an advisory committee of members appointed by the director to help determine the direction of the system's programs and services. After choosing the most feasible activities the director asked the members of the Program Planning Committee to review the choices, the majority of which

pertained to sharing resources. Other activities included continuing education, communication, public relations, and consulting services. After obtaining the committee's approval of the activities, the researcher and the director wrote precise descriptions of them.

The Interviews

During the next six months the researcher and director visited over thirty libraries. Directors, staff, etc., discussed their library's needs and their expectations of benefits to be derived from system membership. They were then shown the description of activities and given a chance to review these and to suggest additional activities. Lastly, the delegates were shown an early draft of the questionnaire.

Over half of those interviewed mentioned the need for workshops and other continuing education. Several interviewees also pointed out the need for less formal opportunities for librarians within an area to meet together to share ideas and discuss common problems. Resource sharing activities such as access to the holdings of other libraries and the facilitation of interlibrary loans were mentioned almost as often as the need for continuing education activities.

The visits were extremely helpful in refining the list of activities with which to survey the membership. A few activities on the original list were combined or dropped and others (stand-alone library automation system, database reference services, cooperative purchasing, the informal discussion sessions, and division of the interlibrary loan activity into an interlibrary loan agreement and an interlibrary loan librarian) were added as a result of the interviews.

The Survey Instrument

A questionnaire was developed using the final list of activities compiled by the researcher and director and approved by the Program Planning Committee. The questionnaires were sent, along with a cover letter and the list of descriptions, to each of the forty-one delegates to the system's District Assembly in mid-February of 1988. [Copies of the questionnaire, cover letter, and activity

descriptions are appended.] The delegates were asked to indicate whether their library's need for SAMS to provide each of the twenty-one activities was extremely high, high, moderate, low, or extremely low. They were then asked to rank the five activities for which their library had the greatest need. The delegates were also asked to suggest other activities and topics for workshops and to list aspects of library operations on which they desired assistance.

The Delegates' Responses

Responses were received from each of the forty-one delegates for a return rate of 100 percent. Such a high return rate is unusual for a mailed survey and is perhaps an indication of the members' interest in SAMS and their commitment to multitype library cooperation. A high rate of return is very important to the success of program planning.

Provision of the Twenty-one Activities

In tabulating the responses to the question which asked the delegates to indicate their library's need for SAMS to provide each of the twenty-one activities listed, points were allotted as follows: Each time a delegate indicated that his or her library had an extremely high need for a particular activity to be provided, a score of five was computed for that activity. Each indication of a high need received four points, a moderate need three points, a low need two points, and an extremely low need one point. Points were totaled for each activity, and an arithmetic average (a mean) was calculated for each.

The activities were then ranked by arranging the means in descending order from the highest to the lowest. (The higher the mean, the more needed the activity was perceived to be by the membership as a group.) A statistical test (standard deviation) was used to ascertain the dispersion (or agreement) of the individual members' ratings of their perceived need for each activity. (The lower the standard deviation, the stronger the agreement of the members.)

A mean score of 3.5 to 4 indicated that the members perceived their need for provision by SAMS of a particular activity to be moderately high to high. The

nine activities so perceived were: workshops, an interlibrary loan agreement, a directory, a newsletter discussion sessions, consulting assistance, access to AULS (Alabama Union List of Serials), on-site training, and telefacsimile document delivery. Agreement on the need for workshops, discussion sessions, a newsletter, and a directory can be seen to have been quite strong. Agreement on the need for an interlibrary loan agreement and for consulting assistance, although not as strong, was still fairly strong. The members' agreement on the need for on-site training and telefacsimile document delivery was much less strong, and their agreement on the need for access to AULS the weakest shown for any of the activities. These standard deviations indicated that members who rated the last three activities highly rated them very highly.

Need for provision by SAMS of the ten activities which obtained mean scores between 3 and 3.5 was perceived as merely moderate to moderately high by system members. Activities on which the members' agreement was weaker, such as a shared circulation system, delivery/courier service, interlibrary loan librarian, and a stand-alone automation system, may have been considered more necessary by individual delegates, however.

Only two activities, cooperative purchasing and database reference service, received mean scores less than 3; the need for these activities was perceived as moderately low to moderate by the group. Their standard deviations, which are among the highest, indicate that some of the members considered their need for the activities to be much greater than that of the overall group, however.

The twenty-one activities are listed below in descending order according to their mean scores.

Activities with Means of 3.5-4	Mean	Standard Deviations
Workshops	3.9512	.9474
ILL Agreement	3.8780	1.0999
Directory	3.8537	.9890
Newsletter	3.7317	.9493
Discussion Sessions	3.6098	.9455
Consulting Assistance	3.5854	1.0482
Access to AULS	3.5854	1.5326
On-site Training	3.5610	1.2460
Telefacsimile	3.5366	1.2267

Activities with Means of 3 - 3.4999	Mean	Standard Deviations
Access to a Union Catalog	3.4878	1.2869
Shared Circulation System	3.3902	1.3015
Speakers' Bureau	3.2439	1.1786
Delivery/Courier Service	3.2429	1.3925
InfoPass	3.2195	1.0843
Scholarships	3.2195	1.1940
Inclusion in AULS	3.2195	1.3695
Inclusion in Union Catalog	3.1463	1.2157
ILL Librarian	3.0976	1.3001
Stand-alone Automation Sys.	3.0976	1.5134

Activities with Means of 2.5-2.9999	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cooperative Purchasing	2.8537	1.5258
Database Reference Services	2.8293	1.4816

A second way to consider the respondents' rating of the activities is to examine the percentage of delegates that indicated an extremely high or high need and the percentage that indicated a low or an extremely low need. When responses of delegates representing all four types of libraries were combined, a majority indicated an extremely high or high need for the following: workshops (76%); newsletter (68%); interlibrary loan agreement and directory (66%); access to AULS (61%); consulting assistance (59%); access to a union catalog for the system (58%); telefacsimile and discussion sessions (54%); and on-site training (51%). A majority (51%) indicated that they had either a low or an extremely low need for database reference service.

Responses According to Type of Library

When responses for each type of library are examined, observation reveals that only one activity, an interlibrary loan agreement, was perceived as being of high need by representatives of three of the four types of libraries⁴ and only one activity, workshops, was rated from moderately high to high by all four groups. Five activities received mean scores indicative of a moderately high to high perceived need from at least three of the four groups. These activities were a directory (academic, special, public); a newsletter (academic, school, public); access

to AULS (academic, special, school); consulting assistance (special, school, public); and access to a union catalog (special, school, public).

Tests were conducted to determine whether the differences observed in the ratings of the activities by representatives of different types of libraries were statistically significant.⁵ Only eight out of the twenty-one activities received ratings that were significantly different: an interlibrary loan agreement, an interlibrary loan librarian, access to the Alabama Union List of Serials, inclusion in the Alabama Union List of Serials, a directory of libraries, cooperative purchasing, a speakers' bureau, and informal discussion sessions.

The need for an interlibrary loan agreement was rated significantly higher by academic, special, and school librarians than by public librarians; school librarians also rated their need for an interlibrary loan librarian significantly higher than did public librarians. The need for access to the Alabama Union List of Serials was rated significantly higher by special than by academic, school, or public librarians; while special librarians rated their need to be included in this tool significantly higher than school librarians. Special librarians also rated their need for a directory of libraries higher than did either school or public librarians.

Cooperative purchasing received a significantly higher rating from academic, school, and public than from special librarians. A speakers' bureau was rated significantly higher by school than by academic, special, or public librarians. The need for having informal discussion sessions was rated significantly higher by public than by school librarians.

Members' Top Priorities

Responses to the question asking members to rank their top priorities were tabulated by assigning a score of five to each of the respondents' first choices, four to the second choices, three to the third choices, two to the fourth choices, and one to the fifth choices. A total score was then calculated for each of the activities. The scores revealed that some of the activities which were perceived to be of extremely high or high need by less than a majority of the members were evidently top priorities of those who did perceive them thusly.

One activity, interlibrary loan agreement, received a score, 75, that was twenty-three points above those obtained for any of the other activities, indicating that several of the delegates ranked this activity highly. In fact, twenty-seven (66%) of the respondents had indicated that their library's needs for SAMS to provide an interlibrary loan agreement was extremely high or high.

Less expected might be the second ranked activity, a shared circulation system, which received 52 points and was the first choice of five, the second choice of six, and the fourth choice of one of the respondents. Although ten activities had obtained higher mean scores, eighteen of the forty-one respondents had indicated that their library's need for SAMS to provide this activity was extremely high or high. Three others had indicated a low need, and four had indicated an extremely low need, however.

The score of 49 received by the third ranked activity, workshops, was surprising only in that it was not higher. The first choice of five, second choice of one, third choice of three, fourth choice of four and fifth choice of three of the respondents, this activity was rated as extremely high or high by thirty (75%) of the respondents and as less than moderate by only three.

A stand-alone library automation system, which was the fourth highest ranked at 44 points, was chosen as the first priority of five, the second priority of three, the third priority of one, and the fourth priority of two of the respondents. Although ten had rated such a system as extremely high or high, seven of the respondents had rated it as low and another nine as extremely low.

Access to AULS received 39 points, database reference services and telefacsimile 38, cooperative purchasing 32, and delivery/courier service and a directory 30 points each. On-site training was awarded 28 points and inclusion in AULS received 22 points.

Recommending Workshop Topics

After being asked to rate the twenty-one activities and rank their top priorities, the delegates were also requested to suggest workshop topics. Twenty-five responded with a total of sixty-three recommendations.

Several of the topics recommended were of interest to representatives of different types of libraries. Of the eight requests for topics related to reference, three were from public, two each from academic and special, and one from a school library representative. The eight requests for workshops on automation were made by four academic, two special, and two school library representatives. Four suggestions for cataloging workshops were offered by two public, one academic, and one school library representative, and four for weeding by two public, one special, and one school library representative. Collection development was suggested by an academic, a special, and a public librarian. Grantsmanship and dealing with the problem patron were each suggested by an academic and a public librarian, book repair by a school and a public library representative, and publicity by a school and an academic library representative.

Many of the additional topics suggested by representatives of only one type of library would seem to have relevance for all types. Most obvious among these were disaster planning, CD Rom, management, personnel administration, supervision, library security, services to the handicapped, preservation, equipment maintenance, selection and cataloging of audio-visuals, scheduling, inventory control, and output measurement.

Supervising student assistants would probably be of interest to academic, public, and school librarians, while teaching library skills to elementary school students, conducting book talks, and motivating high school students to read might be more helpful to public and school librarians. Some suggestions, the most notable being avoiding the duplication of special collections and meetings with other librarians to discuss problems and ideas, would seem to necessitate involvement of representatives from all four types of libraries.

Requesting Consulting Assistance

Several of the library services and operations on which the respondents indicated they would like consulting assistance might also be handled by the workshop format. Most requests were for consulting in reference, cataloging, automation, and collection development.

Recommendations

The researcher recommended that in choosing activities for the overall membership, the director focus especially on activities such as workshops, an interlibrary loan agreement, a directory, a newsletter, informal discussion sessions, and consulting assistance, which also obtained moderately high to high mean score (3.5 or above) and a low or fairly low standard deviation when rated by the group as a whole. Provision by SAMS of these activities was perceived to be needed by a large number of the members.

Consideration should be given to providing the overall membership with access to AULS, on-site training, and telefacsimile, which also obtained moderately high to high mean scores. Although agreement on the need for provision of these activities was less strong, all were rated as extremely high or high by a majority of the members. Consideration of providing access to a union catalog for the system was also recommended because, while obtaining a slightly lower mean score, the need for this activity was also rated as extremely high or high by a majority of the members.

It was recommended that activities with a mean score lower than 3.4 and a low standard deviation, such as InfoPass, speakers' bureau, and scholarships, not be offered at this time since their ratings indicated that the members agreed they did not perceive much need for these activities, none of which was rated as extremely high or high by a majority. Although inclusion in AULS and in a union catalog also fit this description, members' holdings would, of course, have to be included if such a catalog were constructed. The low score for these activities could be a result of the request that delegates consider their libraries' needs rather than the needs of the system as a whole.

Activities with a mean score lower than 3.4 and a high to fairly high standard deviation, such as a shared circulation system, delivery/courier service, an interlibrary loan librarian, a stand-alone library automation system, cooperative purchasing, and database reference services, were not recommended for the membership as a whole. Instead, it was suggested that provision might be

considered for those libraries whose delegates either rated as extremely high or high or chose an activity as a top priority.

The membership as a whole was in strong agreement on the need for SAMS to provide workshops. Since several topics were of interest to representatives of different types of libraries and others seem relevant regardless of library type, it was recommended that consideration be given to offering workshops for the entire membership on as many of the topics recommended by the members as possible and that "mini-workshops" be offered on topics for which fewer members indicated an interest.

Since the interviews and the survey also indicated that members were interested in less formal sessions to discuss mutual problems and share ideas, the researcher recommended that the director sponsor such sessions for librarians within a small (one or two county) area. These informal "get togethers" would seem to be an excellent means of improving cooperation among staff members of different types of libraries within a particular locality. They could, of course, be combined with brief workshops on topics of interest to those invited to attend. Although several of the topics on which members requested consulting assistance might be addressed during workshops, additional assistance might need to be provided to individual libraries.

In summary, both the interviews and the questionnaires showed that the members of SAMS felt a strong need for cooperative activities. In addition to offering activities perceived to be of extremely high or high need by the members, the researcher recommended further that those activities with the greatest potential for encouraging a cooperative spirit among librarians and facilitating the sharing of resources among different types of libraries within a local area be provided.

Use of Study Results

The director found the study to be very helpful in determining system services during the first years of operation. Based on the needs expressed during interviews and the preferences for services indicated on the questionnaire, the

director decided to develop an interlibrary loan agreement and a directory of the system's library resources and to offer at least four continuing education opportunities on topics requested by the members and four informal discussion sessions located in selected localities annually, in addition to providing for referring consulting assistance.

She also began planning a system of document delivery between selected SAMS libraries, using both delivery by courier and telefacsimile transmission. Because it was not practical for the system to provide a shared circulation system (ranked second when members listed, the five activities for which their library had the greatest need) the director chose immediate initiation of delivery and followed the development of group access to OCLC by SOLINET as a networking activity for the SAMS member libraries.

The director continued a program of providing copies of the Alabama Union List of Serials to the members and began plans for including their holdings in the union list of serials and in the statewide database (ALICAT) developed by the state library agency.

In addition to following the recommendations of the researcher in planning services, the director had to keep in mind planning for a permanent funding structure which was being done simultaneously with system activity planning. For this reason, the director looked to services that could derive a recovery of cost from the users, or, in a worst case scenario, would be possible for the members to maintain on their own if the system funding were discontinued. Again, ground delivery provided by a United Parcel Service contract was viewed to be a viable program for cost recovery or member continuation.

The director adopted the results of the needs assessment in her development of a five-year long-range plan. It was determined that the needs assessment would provide the basis for program planning for the first five years of service, after which the process should be repeated to allow for the impact of technological advances on member libraries, and the changing perceptions of the members of a more mature system. The director, the SAMS Board, and the Program Planning Committee believed that the methodology led to such a high degree of accuracy

that no additional formal assessment activities would be necessary for the first five years of service.

NOTES

¹For an excellent explanation of the advantages inherent in multitype cooperation, see Hamilton, Beth A., ed., Multitype Library Cooperation (New York: Bowker, 1977), 3-10. Articles especially relevant to multitype cooperation in rural areas include Coe, Mary J., "Indiana Case Study 2: The Stone Hills Area, A Rural Experience," in Multitype Cooperation, 75-81; DeJohn, William, "The Impact of Technology and Networks on the Future of Rural Public Library Service," Library Trends 28 (Spring 1980): 633-648; and Hedding, Linda, "Cooperative Opportunities for Rural Libraries," Rural Libraries 3 (Fall 1983): 61-73.

²American Library Directory, 41st ed. (New York: Bowker, 1988).

³According to the Bureau of the Census definition of rural as "places of less than 2500 population and outside of urbanized areas." U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population: United States Summary, (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1972), vol. 1, pt. 1, p.x.

⁴The highest mean obtained for any activity rated by the public library representatives as a group was 3.8571, so no activity could be considered to have been rated high (a mean score of 4) by all four groups.

⁵A two-tailed T test was used to analyze whether there was a significant difference according to type of library. To be considered significantly different, comparison of the pairs of means obtained for an activity would have to result in a p less than .05.



GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF LIBRARY SERVICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

February 18, 1983

Dear SAMS Member,

Kathy Wright and I certainly enjoyed our visit with you. We appreciated your giving us a tour of the facilities and sharing your aspirations for the library with us. Our talks with you and the other members helped us develop the enclosed list of activities. As you will see, we have added several activities to the original list we left with you.

We would appreciate it very much if you would help us further by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Based on suggestions made during our visits, we decided to conduct the survey through the mail rather than over the telephone as originally intended. Kathy asked me to remind you to call her at SAMS headquarters (244-9264) if you have any questions concerning the activities as you are filling out your questionnaire. If she is not in the office, please leave a message on her answering machine. She will return your call as soon as possible.

Please return the completed questionnaire to me in the enclosed envelope by March 4th. If I have not received it by March 9th I will assume you have questions about the questionnaire itself and will call you as originally promised. Please address each activity in terms of your library's needs rather than in terms of the needs of the overall system. You are welcome to solicit the opinions of your staff and board members, but please return only one questionnaire per library. Thank you in advance for helping your director determine which of the many activities possible are needed by SAMS members.

Yours truly,

Annabel Stephens
Assistant Professor

AS/fw
Enclosure

NEEDS ASSESSMENT--SAMS MEMBERS

1. Please indicate your library's need for SAMS to provide each of the activities listed below by placing an X in the appropriate box. (Descriptions of each of the activities are included in your packet.)

Activities	NEED FOR ACTIVITY				
	Extremely High	High	Moderate	Low	Extremely Low
A. Interlibrary Loan Agreement					
B. Interlibrary Loan Librarian					
C. Database Reference Services					
D. Delivery/Courier Service					
E. Telefacsimile Service					
F. Info-Pass					
G. Cooperative Purchasing					
H. Directory of Libraries					
I. Inclusion in Alabama Union List of Serials					
J. Access to Alabama Union List of Serials					
K. Inclusion in a Union Catalog for the System					
L. Access to a Union Catalog for the System					
M. Shared Circulation System					
N. Stand-alone Library Automation System					
O. Scholarships					
P. Workshops					
Q. On-site Training					
R. Discussion Sessions					
S. Newsletter					
T. Speakers' Bureau					
U. Consulting Assistance					

2. Please indicate by letter (in order of priority) the five activities from the above list for which your library has the greatest need.

Highest
Priority

Lowest
Priority
(of the five)

3. If your library needs for SAMS to provide any activities not previously mentioned, please list these.

4. Please suggest topics of workshops for SAMS members.

<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>

5. If you would like consulting assistance on particular library services and operations, please list these.

<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>

Name _____

Name of Library _____
(or other
organization)

Phase I Activities

RESOURCE SHARING

Interlibrary Loan Agreement	An agreement for loaning materials between SAMS libraries which will simplify borrowing protocol, where needed, and provide a method of protection for lending libraries
Interlibrary Loan Librarian	A SAMS employee who will verify requests from member libraries and make arrangements for having materials transferred from library to library once an interlibrary loan agreement has been established
Database Reference Services	Access to databases such as DIALOG, BRS, MEDLINE, NEXUS, etc., to which your library does not subscribe .
Delivery/Courier Service	Transport of materials from one SAMS library to another
Telefacsimile Service	A service providing for instant transfer of photocopies of articles or pages of books from library to library
Info-Pass	An agreement by which patrons of one SAMS library can receive permission to check out materials from another SAMS library on a one-time basis
Cooperative Purchasing	Allows for discount purchase of like items such as computer software, supplies and equipment, and print and non-print materials by buying in bulk
Directory of Libraries	Information on the collection strengths, special collections, hours, services, and staff specialties of SAMS libraries
Inclusion in Alabama Union List of Serials	Including records of the periodical holdings of your library in the Alabama Union List of Serials (AULS)
Access to Alabama Union List of Serials	Having a copy of the Alabama Union List of Serials (AULS) provided to your library
Inclusion in a Union Catalog for the System	Having the materials owned by your library listed in a union catalog for SAMS members
Access to a Union Catalog for the System	Having a union catalog of materials owned by SAMS libraries created and a copy provided to your library
Shared Circulation System	An automated system with which to circulate materials, generate overdue notices, inventory holdings, and have immediate knowledge of the availability of materials owned by other SAMS libraries participating in the automated network

Stand-alone Library Automation System Shared purchasing of stand-alone software for library applications by individual libraries (This would allow cost savings but not the networking capability of a shared circulation system.)

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Scholarships Funding for staff members of SAMS libraries to attend workshops and meetings

Workshops Library service educational programs for staff from several SAMS libraries

On-site Training Training held at a SAMS library to meet the particular needs of that library

Discussion Sessions Informal gatherings to exchange ideas and discuss problems and their solutions with other SAMS members

COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Newsletter A newsletter which will include information on system activities and items of interest to SAMS members

Speakers' Bureau Listing of individuals with expertise in areas of interest to SAMS members who have agreed to be available as speakers

CONSULTING SERVICES

Consulting Assistance Assistance with the planning and implementation of library services and operations