

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium  
Technology Collaboration Operations Committee Notes  
January 27, 2021 at 2:00 pm**

**ATTENDEES:** Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Craig Ellefson (SCLS), Lori Roholt (IFLS), Kris Schwartz (IFLS)

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

Meeting started at 2:00 pm.

M. Clark started the meeting with round of introductions.

**1. Project Proposal Discussion:**

At the last meeting two projects were proposed, one around an analytics dashboard and another for EZproxy. Additional information has been gathered about these projects.

A form was created to gather ideas on projects for this group to consider.

L. Roholt shared the below idea with the group. She sees this as a tool used primarily by library directors in their decision making and in their reporting to their governing and municipal bodies. She sees value in having all of these metrics in one place and always available as needed. IFLS has a homegrown solution that is aging, so looking for the next option. M. Mercier shared an interest in this type of product/resource. SCLS shared they have Tableau for their system with several dashboards – involves a data analyst and a team on staff.

**Project description:** Analytics dashboard for libraries to find quantitative data as needed

**Need or problem addressed by project:** Member libraries regularly need to report service metrics from multiple sources to library boards and other stakeholders, and for decision-making purposes. Directors and staff appreciate a centralized source for this data that is easy to use and understand. The need is immediate and ongoing

**Potential Benefits:** Save time, Increase access/equitable services, Share expertise, Large scope - involves many libraries and/or systems

**Potential partners/vendors:** Redash, Tableau, or another data visualization product?

**Project time frame:** Indefinite project

**Project evaluation:** The tool would need to provide all or most of the information regularly reported to library boards. Semi-annual evaluation would ensure that the tool includes relevant, accurate information, and provide opportunity for libraries to suggest additional metrics

**Has system/library invested time or money already:** Yes, we currently have a homegrown "dashboard" incorporating several data sources. It likely needs to be replaced wholesale, though some data harvesting methods may translate to a new interface

Moving forward/next steps:

- The group was asked if we need to put together a more robust proposal to bring to the Technology Steering Committee.
- If so, what should that proposal entail?
  - Goals and needs of the project
  - Who is interested statewide?
  - Potential vendors and costs
  - Who already has a solution that we could learn from? Piggy back on something existing?
  - Address the issue how a single tool work across different systems.
- Do we put together a small work group to produce a brief proposal that includes the above bulleted components?
- There was a suggestion to include Jody, Data Analyst, at SCLS on the potential dashboard project.
- K. Schwartz and L. Roholt volunteered to help, however it was decided that perhaps we have enough to share with the Steering Committee before putting more work into building out a full proposal.
- M. Clark will take the information we already have to the Steering Committee to get their initial feedback on what else they'd like to see to move something like this forward.
- Consensus to move the analytics dashboard forward as a proposed project.

M. Mercier shared her suggestion on Deep Freeze and statewide purchase. In Bridges, all of their libraries purchase Deep freeze, however they don't do a system wide purchase. M. Clark asked if Bridges has explored a system-wide purchase. They haven't done that yet, but thought this group might be a better place to start looking at a larger, cooperative purchase. NWLS, WVLS and IFLS just consolidated their Deep Freeze group purchase – biggest discount came when they consolidated just IFLS, but not as much of a discount when three systems together. SCLC has 750 licenses and due for renewal in June. Widespread agreement that a big discount for a statewide purchase is doubtful. Faronics has the primary share of this market, so they are not as willing to negotiate better pricing. Pricing is roughly \$35/license and \$16/year for 3-year maintenance agreement. This need/topic comes up annually, but no real direction on how to manage a statewide purchase. Maybe the advantage is less about reducing price, but allowing greater access to this resource.

There was consensus to take this project to the Steering Committee for feedback as well.

**Project description:** statewide purchase/pricing for deep freeze

**Need or problem addressed by project:** many libraries use it and its \$\$

**Potential Benefits:** Save money, Increase access/equitable services, Large scope - involves many libraries and/or systems

**Potential partners/vendors:** Faronics

**Project time frame:** Indefinite project

**Project evaluation:** na

**Has system/library invested time or money already:** na

State-wide purchase and potential management of EZ Proxy or some type of authentication service was also suggested by M. Mercier. The committee held a brief discussion on the EZ Proxy needs.

There was a question that if we had a statewide agreement, could it run under one instance of EZ Proxy? Sounds like yes, EZ Proxy could discern between differing access to databases depending upon library affiliation. More information on this would be gathered as a part of the process.

IFLS/MORE doesn't use any service like this, and hasn't had a call for this directly from their members. But they would be interested if this could be a way to improve the analytics/reporting of database usage.

**Project description:** Authentication for remote database connections

**Need or problem addressed by project:** This would allow people at home to be able to be authenticated to use databases

**Potential Benefits:** Save money, Save time, Increase access/equitable services, Share expertise

**Potential partners/vendors:** libraries, library systems

**Project time frame:** Long term (5+ years)

**Project evaluation:** na

**Has system/library invested time or money already:** We purchased ezproxy in 2020

The group agreed that all three of these project ideas will be taken to the Tech Steering Committee for feedback as well as feedback on the proposal process in general.

## 2. Project Proposal Template

Project managers created a template for new potential projects to be presented to the group and has been used to present the previously discussed ideas.

From the previous conversation and review of submitted project ideas, the group was asked for ideas for improvement and usability for the form.

- Maybe include a question asking if the form submitter is aware of any existing solutions deployed currently across the state to use as an exemplar or reference point?
- L. Roholt felt the form was adequate in describing her needs proposal for her suggested project.
- Perhaps Tech Steering Committee will request additional data points?
- M. Clark will share this template with Steering.

## 3. New Opportunities for Collaboration/Idea Sharing

The group was asked if there were any new potential projects and to consider the following questions.

- *What technology related problems are you seeing within your library/system?*

- *Are there any major pain points you have with existing processes/procedures?*
  1. Installing and maintaining printers – takes a lot of time. Better way of deploying printers. PrinterLogic is an expensive solution. Group policies don't work well in our environment.
    - a. Q: cooperative purchase to reduce PrinterLogic or centralized administration of a product like PrinterLogic.
  2. Help Desk software – Bridges is working on this right now. Not a pain point, but something others might be exploring.
    - a. IFLS uses HelpScout and they love it. Not expensive.
    - b. Spiceworks (SCLS) – free hosted version. But will be replacing it later this year. Vivantio and FreshService are possible options.

M. Clark will report back to this group after the Tech Steering Committee meets and has feedback to share.

Meeting adjourned at 3:01 pm.

**Next meeting date:** April 6, 2021 at 10:00 am