

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Collaboration Steering Committee Notes
February 14, 2022 at 10:00 am
via zoom***

ATTENDEES: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), Steve Heser (MCFLS), Karol Kennedy (BLS), Sherry Machones (NWLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), John Thompson (IFLS)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Melody Clark (WiLS)

1. Call to Order & New Member Introductions

Chair J. Gilderson-Duwe called the meeting to order at 10:00 am
New member, Steve Heser, introduced himself.

2. Review Agenda – changes or additions

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

3. Approval of minutes – [November 2, 2021](#)

J. Thompson moved approval of the minutes. K. Kennedy seconded. Motion carried. S. Heser abstained.

4. Reports: Committee/Workgroup Updates

a. WPLC Technology Operations Committee Meeting Notes – [January 20, 2022](#)

M. Clark gave a report from the Operations Committee meeting. There are no updates about the Deep Freeze project. Project lead is working with the vendor to get more information and schedule a demo for those that are interested.

The Tech Operations group had two surveys out in the field since this group last met. One on a potential data dashboard project and one on a potential EZ Proxy project.

The data dashboard survey received eight responses. Of them six respondents currently have dashboards or have libraries within their systems that have a dashboard. Of those, four are custom built, in-house dashboards; one is a SirsiDynix BlueCloud Analytics product and one is Tableau. On average, they are all relatively satisfied with their current dashboard, no one noting that they are completely unsatisfied. Many of the custom built have little to no cost, whereas those using a vendor product pay between \$1,200 and \$15,000.

One part of the survey asked what components they want to see in a dashboard and there were a variety of responses, which was helpful to gather to give the group an understanding of the wants.

The survey also asked how systems and libraries envision using the dashboard. Most would use it for reporting to their boards, for planning and making data-driven decisions.

The group agreed from the interest that the survey results showed that they want to pursue this project and a project lead was identified, Mellanie Mercier from Bridges

volunteered. Right now, project managers are working to identify vendors and get possible quotes. Once that information has been compiled, it will be brought to this Committee for approval.

J. Gilderson-Duwe suggested that a more realistic wish list be compiled to utilize when working with vendors.

It was asked if the IFLS dashboard could be modernized. J. Thompson wasn't sure. S. Hesper noted that they have done a lot of customization but their changes are just building off of what was originally created and they haven't made any changes to the main platform. If vendors can't offer the automation, the only option might be to find someone to update/maintain the current IFLS product.

Similarly, the EZ Proxy survey had twelve responses. Of them, four currently use EZ Proxy and of those four they are relatively satisfied with the product. Current annual cost is between \$ 520 - \$1500 and are all locally hosted. For those libraries that do not use EZproxy, two others use another product, both Innovative's Web Access Management through their Sierra ILS and others use a home-grown solution, either through their ILS or PHP or SQL scripts. Most of those other solutions are bundled with their ILS. All respondents are interested or maybe interested in learning more about a statewide negotiated procurement.

The Tech Operations group was pleased with the results and interest and agreed to move forward with this project as well. A project lead was identified. Keetra Baker from Winnifox volunteered. Next steps for this are to connect with Elizabeth Newman at DPI to see if there is interest to do more at the state level. E. Newman attended a Technology Operations Committee to talk about DPI's authentication process and mentioned that DPI might have interest in a statewide authentication service.

Once information has been shared with DPI, quotes will be gathered and information will be brought to this committee for project approval.

J. Gilderson-Duwe suggested the creation of a specification list of needs before going to vendors.

MCFLS is very interested in this. They are currently using an ILS product, but are interested in getting better statistics, such as page hits, session stats, where patrons are coming from, etc.

5. New Discussion Items

a. Discussion: Digital Archives and Technology Backup Committees check-in

A form has been sent out to systems to sign up members for the two new committees. The group reviewed the submissions and there was consensus that the two new committees are ready to call their first meetings.

V. Teal-Lovely noted that the Backup Collaborations participants are also the operations group. They are currently working on MOUs, cost, etc.

It was noted that if the committees are a bit heavy on the operations side, so they could always lean on this committee for governance input. They will be a combination of operations and governance.

Winnefox does have someone that they want to add to the backup committee.

Project managers will connect with the committees to schedule their first meeting dates.

b. Discussion: Orientation Packet

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. It was noted there was an error in the Organizational Chart. The two new tech committees should be under the Board, not the Tech Steering Committee.

6. Committee information sharing and questions

J. Gilderson-Duwe noted he is very pleased with how the technology project process was going. They surveys have shown interest and have proven to be valuable.

S. Heser noted MCFLS is looking at doing a survey on copier services and asked if anyone else has done research on copiers services. K. Anderson noted their IT wants to do this, but hasn't gotten to it yet.

7. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment: May 9, 2022 at 10:00 am

The group agreed to change the time of the next meeting from 10:00 am to 1:00 pm on May 9th.

S. Heser moved to adjourn and K. Kennedy seconded. Meeting ended at 1:44 pm.