

Ad Hoc Committee Meeting to discuss formation of UC-Circheads

Results of meeting, held on August 4, 1995, UCLA.

Nancy Beale, Claire Bellanti, Sharon Bullard, Sharla Desens, Sara Eichhorn, Diane Keen, Beverly Renford, and Don Sloan.

Intro/Mission

To take an active leadership role in establishing communication, and cooperation between UC circulation units to improve service to our users.

Purpose: to improve public service with joint efforts by

-establishing a more formalized relationship with HOPS

*responding to assignments from HOPS, DLA, and other systemwide organizations

*providing timely and standardized response to HOPS where possible -strengthening problem solving capabilities

*sharing information and experiences

*preparing for the circulation function in the "electronic" environment as opposed to the "automated" environment

*designing ideal circulation workstation for user and staff

-enhancing communication and fostering cooperation between UC campuses and facilities

*networking

*assisting each other with new technology

*establishing a directory of UC circulation contact people

*exchanging training documents to avoid replication of effort

*providing central training when needed -identifying potential budgetary power and taking advantage of available opportunities

*exerting influence because of size, e.g., on purchasing agreements

*pressuring vendors for enhancements -evaluating and responding to pertinent recommendations or proposals from the

University relating to circulation

DISCUSSION

Model 1 possibly 57 members

supervisor from every LIBRARY circulation unit system-wide

possible membership: UCLA 9

UCB 23

UCSD 9

UCR 2-3

UCI 4

UCSB 1

UCSC 2

UCD 3

UCSF-1

NRLF 1

SRLF 1

possible total : 57 representatives

Pros: Cons:

- greater opportunities for participation - size
 - more viewpoints - travel support
 - more likely to support decisions - requires high level organizational structure
- frequency of meetings may be problematic

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Leadership:

- requires development of leadership structure
- HOPS liaison determined by appointment

Communication

- email

- video teleconferences.
- regional and or statewide meetings

Model 2 11 members

1 rotating representative from campuses and storage facility

Pros: Cons:

- consistency of membership -only one rep selected per term
- size -more limited viewpoints
- easier financial support -requires concentrated effort
- most appropriate person representing campus to solicit viewpoints in
- business conducted more quickly advance
- easier to meet if smaller -less opportunity for team
- realistic participation
- requires outstanding communication skills to represent campuses

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Communication:

- email
- video conference
- regional meetings
- telephone conference

Leadership:

HOPS appointment

Campus should appoint rotating representation

Model 3 22 members

1 rotating representative from each campus and storage facility, plus one guest

Pros: Cons:

- more viewpoints -size
- more likely to support decisions -travel support
- more of a team approach possible -frequency of meeting may be
- especially good for regional meetings problematic
- realistic

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Communication:

- email
- video conference
- regional meetings
- telephone conference

Leadership:

HOPS appointment

Campus should appoint rotating representation