Announcements:
SOPAG ACG mtg to take place on Oct 19th

1) Report of the Online Library Instruction Group <30 min> (Amy & Annette to lead) Guest Annette Marines UCSC (along with HOPS member Ellen Meltzer)

Executive summary has top findings, conclusion has other recommendations. Requests for many committees, HOPS conversation infers some of the committees could be nested. A call for a CIG for digital instruction. (CIG can help with system-wide perspective and allow us to develop expertise).

Perception from committee that UC is lagging behind digital instruction based on what ACRL PRIMO users have adopted vs. UC librarians, as reported in the survey that was distributed to UC library instructors. Nation-wide, video is desired, the UCs tend to be more text/HTML focused.

TF feels this is an opportunity to develop best practices.

Much interest in professional development, questions on how to do remotely.

Interest in an online community so that librarians can learn more from one another, build trust.

Pointed out that there currently is an online space for sharing learning objects: here

Concern from HOPS that any CIG would need to have a purpose beyond chatting/trust building.

There used to be an Instruction CIG under HOPS

Where is the pedagogical approach to online education?

UCB has online masters programs, extension, EdX, etc. They are meeting on how to best address needs (policy first – who are users, what do they need). Once they answer these questions, they’ll know more. Many of our campuses are having the same conversations with resident education experts.
ACTION: I (Amy) was to ask TF for more info -- something that can specifically be used. However I’d like to float this option before HOPS. I would like for HOPS to accept this report and thank the committee. It can stand as a representation of what the current UC trends in online library instruction are at this moment in time. We (HOPS) can then consider how we want to move forward with online instruction or simply general instruction. CIG or not?

2) Proposal to establish a central funding mechanism supporting the infrastructure for the UC digital reference service <20 min> (Meltzer to lead)

Much discussion about funding mechanisms. The TF focused on offering three scenarios for how costs could be shared. HOPS explained that the needed model should be on how costs can be paid (i.e. x10 pay for service just as we do with SCP?)

- TF to meet again and work on a permanent funding model
- Funding model needs to replicate one of the ways that the UCs now pay for a shared service.
- Be aware that any cost shares that limit $$ by use may be problematic and/or set a precedent that could destabilize other cost share models.

TF asked to look hard at exactly how much time needs to go into the position.

Give a cost model with salary ranges. (perhaps modeling the .5 administrator of the SCP).

Priorities within the report should be:

- How to pay
- Design of central funding for administrator
- Options for what to pay

**ACTION: TF work to be due by next meeting, September 27th**

3) Qwidget in play, comments? <10 min> (Lynn to lead)

Turned on Aug 15th, 5-9am is highest use. All use went up 15%

4) Future of HOPS? <30 min> (Amy to lead)

- Discussion of what we expect to accomplish in HOPS this year
- Amy to present ideas
- F2F mtg(s)

Discussion of what we expect to do this year in HOPS

GOALS:
a: to use HOPS for its system-wide power
b: to align our vision and goals with that of UCOP/Campus/future norms
c: use the strength of x10 to make staffing changes

For discussion/consideration: Next Generation Public Services: I’d like to propose that we take charge of our public services and develop a NGPS Platform. Such a platform would take a lead by constructing a UC-wide perspective on public services (ILL, Ref, Circ, Reserves, etc).

I’d like us to prepare a document on local practices

- How we are organized (org chart for each campus specifically breaking out public services)
- Once we understand how we are organized we can explore if it would advantage us to develop a UC public services standard in regards to ref, etc?
- I hear that each of us is evolving in how we perform our public services. If we were all on the same page and had considered changes in tandem with our staff in a grand PS exploration – could we manage to move into the future and do PS more effectively?

UC Public Services have been involved in strategic partnerships for years (Ex: digital reference and instruction). This is the time to formalize the relationships and build on the energy and practices that the BSTF and NGTS have actualized. The goal is to continue to “transform the user experience of search and retrieval” while adding a focus on service.

With so many staff dedicated to ongoing NGTS and local projects, HOPS is considering a modest proposal to act on three specific aspects of public services:

Providing a more efficient and effective ILL services

- This line of focus will tie in with the “HOPS/RSC Response to ILL Policies and Procedures.”

Online Instruction Support

- HOPS, working with Instruction Librarians, will ascertain how to best support teaching (both f2f and online) with the development and disbursement of learning objects, tutorials and more. The goal is to develop a more successful UC-wide approach.

Digital Reference Services

- Working with SOPAG and CoULs, develop a central funding mechanism for OCLC 24/7 Reference and develop a model for a part-time coordinator who will manage scheduling and reports for the service.
- Out of the 24/7 service experience we can build a subject expertise reference model.

All three of the tasks above are in process to some degree. A NGPS infrastructure will ensure that these initiatives move forward with shared systemwide support and understanding of our goals.
HOPS plans on meeting f2f this fall to move forward on the above projects.

5) To be addressed via e-mail

a. HOPS/RSC ILL report

Document owner: Greg Careaga