

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Collaboration Operations Committee Notes
January 12, 2023, 2:00 pm**

ATTENDEES: Keetra Baker (WLS), Eric Henry (MCFLS), Bill Herman (DPI), Kerri Hilbelink (SCLS), Pete Hodge (WLS), Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Tony Kriskovich (NWLS), John Kronenburg (NFLS), Walter Leifeld (WRLS), Lori Roholt (IFLS), Kris Schwartz (IFLS), Tou Yan (WRLS)

ABSENT: Mellanie Mercier (BLS)

GUESTS: Melissa Aro (DPI)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Jennifer Chamberlain (WiLS), Melody Clark (WiLS)

Meeting started at 2:00 pm

J. Chamberlain explained the redistribution of committee responsibilities among the WPLC project managers, so she will be serving as the primary contact for this team and the Tech Steering committee.

1. Committee Orientation

The [orientation packet](#) is updated at the beginning of every year to include updated information for the Committee. The group reviewed the responsibilities of the committee, as well as the committee membership, which is open to any technology professional from any Wisconsin Public Library System.

There were no questions about the packet.

2. Recap of Joint meeting with the Technology Steering Committee

The last Technology Operations committee meeting was held [jointly with the Technology Steering committee](#) on November 14. The group was asked their reaction to the joint meeting. K. Schwartz felt it was good and informative.

Some suggestions that came out of the joint meeting were to reorder discussion agenda topics and to broaden participation by reaching out to all systems in advance to meetings. The group agreed that it was a good idea to try and put a call out in advance to all systems with questions, as well as have a front and center space for idea generation. L. Roholt noted that it may be helpful to think about who is not present but might benefit and then reach out to that system. It was noted that the Steering Committee could play a role in helping to identify who is missing from the table. J. Kronenburg noted that the more communication is put out there, the more likely people are to get involved.

Incentivizing projects was also an idea shared at the joint meeting. A. Hoks noted that incentivizing will not work if time is not available. K. Schwartz agrees that if systems don't have time to take a lead on a project, an incentive will not mean anything. K. Baker noted that if it is possible, it is still a good idea for the leading system to get some sort of benefit/incentive.

3. Project Update – EZ Proxy

Project managers have been working with OCLC to create a quote with some different scenarios. A spreadsheet with quotes was shared prior to the meeting. The group briefly reviewed the spreadsheet and gathered some initial reactions and questions.

Follow up questions for OCLC:

- Does the hosted version of EZproxy include statistics?
- If all systems/libraries listed in the quote do not participate, will the pricing change?

The group was tasked with reviewing and sharing the spreadsheet and sending additional questions to project managers by January 18th.

Project managers will compile questions and send them to OCLC. Next step then is to take information to the Technology Steering Committee.

It was asked if anyone has a way to explain the use of EZproxy. K. Baker noted they use it as a way to allow patrons remote access for those outside of the library.

4. Project Update – Data Dashboard

The data dashboard project has been on hold while we determine the needs, scope, and stakeholders. Representatives from DPI were invited to share their interest in this project and ask questions they may have regarding what systems are looking for in a data dashboard.

B. Herman noted that DPI is very interested in supporting a project like this. He noted he met with Ben Miller and Melissa Aro (DPI library data consultant) to talk about data dashboards for libraries, and DPI's interest in helping to support them. In broad terms, DPI sees the value in providing real-time data to libraries about key indicators of patron use. They would be interested in supporting or helping to support startup expenses, such as establishing connections between the LMS and a dashboard such as Tableau or Bootstrap, and developing an initial set of reports. LSTA funds for this could be available as soon as July 1 of 2023.

We would not be able to use LSTA funding to pay for licensing costs for a dashboard product, even in year one.

M. Aro noted that WiLS has done a data landscape study and will be doing focus groups which can inform this conversation as well. In DPI's five-year plan, they have an interest in making data more visible in ways other than just spreadsheets. She noted some states are using other tools that DPI is interested in. Michigan is using LibPass for a directory. Libpass is also building APIs.

M. Aro also noted that by the end of the year, DPI will have PowerBI external facing reports and that WiLS has also released dashboards that meet the data needs for some systems.

It was asked if anyone has talked to DOA about getting a discount for Tableau. The group was not aware this was possible.

M. Aro shared there will be an individual from the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign at the RIPL conference (this year in Madison) talking about a data tool kit they are trying to create.

It was noted that it needs to be decided/defined what is “real-time” and what that need really is for systems and libraries. Is it really every minute? Is it daily? Weekly, etc. L. Roholt noted that when she says real-time, she means updated overnight is sufficient.

B. Herman asked how different is the setup from one system to the next? It was noted it would depend on the database, and between the systems they all have different bases; MS SQL, PostgreSQL, etc.

It was asked if it should be a goal to design an intermediary, common data model for each system as a step to get data into a commonly designed database.

J. Chamberlain asked if part of this process is drawing out the architecture of this project. Does DPI envision this as a tool to replace the annual report? DPI sees it as a way for libraries to access other libraries’ data but not supplant the annual report.

DPI would like to know from the system what data they want and how often, as well as what information is needed daily, etc.

It was noted that this could be a tiered onboarding where ILSs are connected first, and then other information is connected in phases.

It was noted that SCLS does query their ILS server and connect that to their instance of Tableau. SCLS: [Profile - scls | Tableau Public](#)

L. Roholt doesn’t want to rule out starting locally but ultimately would love to use that locally collected data to automatically populate the annual report.

Next steps – DPI will connect with DOA about discounts for Tableau and internally discuss if they want to delve into trying to build a middle-tier structure and how they can help with building out reporting.

The group will work toward creating a spec sheet of reporting needs, as well as including big dream items like annual report connections and a statewide hosted database where you would select the library/system for data.

5. Idea Sharing

This is a standing agenda item for discussion.

- *What new technology-related projects is your system working on?*
- *What technology-related problems are you seeing within your library/system?*
- *Are there any major pain points you have with existing processes/procedures?*

J. Kronenburg noted NFLS contracts with OWLnet for their network now, but they will be moving to Active Directory. They are starting from scratch and are currently taking training from Server Academy. T. Kriskovich noted he has a checklist for implementing Active Directory and can share it out.

A. Hoks noted they are implementing multi-factor authentication and are busy working on implementing and onboarding systems for the Technology Backup Collaboration project. They are also working on Windows 11 installs and updates for their time management software, MyPC.

It was asked If anyone uses a single sign-on. No one has currently implemented it. It was noted that in an ideal world they should use single sign-on, but implementing it would be very difficult and is out of reach of most systems' capacity.

Next meeting date: April 4, 2023 at 11:00 am

The meeting ended at 3:30 pm