

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium  
Technology Collaboration Steering Committee Notes  
March 9, 2021 at 2:00 pm  
via zoom\***

**ATTENDEES:** Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), Karol Kennedy (BLS), Sherry Machones (NWLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), John Thompson (IFLS), Kimberly Young (MLS)

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

Meeting started at 2:00 pm

M. Clark started the meeting with a round of introductions.

**1. Discussion and Action: Nomination of Technology Steering Chair**

Gilderson-Duwe moved to nominate himself for chair position, Thompson seconded. In discussion, Teal Lovely reminded the group of the history of this group and how it is an evolution of collaborations throughout the past several years. Motion passed, Gilderson-Duwe abstained from the vote.

Anderson asked if the history of the evolving technology collaborations/groups have been documented anywhere. Teal Lovely has some materials and can work on documenting the history and creating a chronology.

Teal Lovely shared a brief background on the currently underway backup solution collaborative. Kennedy asked how this group intersects, if at all, with the current backup collaboration. Gilderson-Duwe reported that when this Technology Collaboration was proposed it was intentionally decided it would address *future* collaborations, rather than attempting to take on an existing project. Teal Lovely reported that it would be beneficial for the progress of the back-up collaborative to fold that project into this committee's oversight –committee agreed via consensus. Clark suggested we invite current back-up collaborative partners to the next meeting to discuss this request more fully. Reminder: the back-up collaboration has two parts, one of which is digitization and that piece also includes Recollection Wisconsin as a partner.

It was noted that participation in any technology projects that this group oversees will not need to involve all systems. Clark clarified that the Technology operations committee membership can flex, with system staff rotating in/out depending upon the projects being considered.

Clark will include a legacy project discussion on the next steering meeting agenda, as well as invite key partners.

**2. Discussion: Committee Roles, Responsibilities, Meeting Frequency and Orientation Packet**

The orientation packet was shared and it was asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised.

**3. Discussion: Review of Technology Operations Committee Notes and Information**

The Committee reviewed and discussed the project proposal submission form and process. This form is a tool for the Operations Committee to gather information from libraries and systems throughout the state.

- Thompson suggested the operations committee vet the projects and bring recommended proposals to the steering committee. Proposals should include a project summary, brief presentation and an identified contact(s) for each project the operations committee endorses.
- It was asked where in the process would we gather system interest on particular projects? Gather interest at the time of the project proposal, or after the WPLC board considers the proposal? Gilderson-Duwe thought there should be various touchpoints throughout the process for systems to signal their interest. We don't want to overburden the operations committee to gather system participation as their focus should be on innovation and moving projects forward.
- It was asked if there was anything was missing from the interest form. Suggestion by Gilderson-Duwe to add a catch-all comments section, and an estimated project costs if known suggested by Thompson (rough numbers).

### **Review of potential projects**

The Tech Operations Committee has identified three potential projects. The Steering Committee was asked if they think any of the three projects are less viable. Committee feels all three are viable projects, with varying degrees of complexity.

- Group licensing of software – low hanging fruit and could be fairly straightforward by negotiating with the vendor directly.
- Data dashboards – might warrant a pilot on various platforms. More involved.

Question from Gilderson-Duwe: should this steering committee develop a proposal review checklist to evaluate proposals? Who will do the work/follow through? Who takes the lead on the project? The Committee will further discuss this at an upcoming meeting.

Should the Operations Committee identify a project lead in advance of submitting a proposal? It is preferred if the Operations Committee include a project lead if one is known.

Anderson asked if we should concentrate on one project at a time? Thompson noted that projects vary in level of difficulty. We could categorize projects: process/long-term project, vs. procurement project, or positioning the project for external opportunities (funding for example, or state initiatives). Gilderson-Duwe suggested the Operations Committee bring any proposal forward they feel that are ready and the Steering Committee serves as the authority to pass proposals along to the board for full consideration.

Operations can bring in others within their systems with expertise needed for various projects.

Gilderson-Duwe asked if this group should consider a technology strategic plan to guide development from collaborative system standpoint? To frame a direction for the technology operations team. Teal Lovely agreed this would be beneficial especially for big picture projects to develop a statewide roadmap. Machones disagreed and suggested we focus more on opening up more conversations to see what bubbles up organically, as opposed to developing a large scale, top-down strategic plan.

Operations Committee meets next on April 6, Clark will bring the suggestions from this group to that committee.

Gilderson-Duwe and Teal Lovely will work on a chronology/history document of how we got here.

**4. Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting of the Technology Steering Committee will be held on May 4, 2021 at 1:00 pm

Adjourned meeting at 3:25 pm.