

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Collaboration Steering Committee Notes
May 4, 2021 at 3:00 pm
via zoom**

ATTENDEES: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), Karol Kennedy (BLS), John Thompson (IFLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS)

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

1. Call to order

Chair, J. Gilderson-Duwe called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm

2. Review Agenda – changes or additions

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

3. Approval of minutes – [March 9, 2021](#)

J. Thompson moved approval of the minutes. K. Anderson seconded. Motioned carried.

4. Reports: Committee/Workgroup Updates

a. WPLC Technology Operations Committee Meeting Notes – [April 6, 2021](#)

M. Clark gave a brief overview of the Technology Operations Committee meeting notes and provided an update on the group's current projects. She shared that the requests from this Steering Committee for project proposal submissions was discussed and incorporated into the current projects that the Operations Committee is undertaking. For the Faronics/Deep freeze project, a lead was identified and the group discussed how to gather library/system interest. Project managers were tasked with drafting a solicitation survey template that can be used for various projects. The group is currently working offline on finalizing that. It will then be sent out to three identified groups: the WPLC Board email list to forward on to IT folks in their systems, the Tech-a-talka list and the DPI Tech list.

The group is starting with the Deep Freeze project and then will also begin working on the proposal for an analytics dashboard. A lead has been identified for that as well.

M. Clark reported that there will most likely be a presentation on the Deep Freeze project at the next Tech Steering Committee Meeting.

K. Anderson asked how new members get added to the Operations Committee. Systems can send the update request to project managers.

J. Gilderson-Duwe inquired on how the Operations Committee received the request from the Steering Committee for proposal suggestions. M. Clark reported that it was well received and the guidance helped the Operations Committee form the process.

J. Gilderson-Duwe inquired about the EZ Proxy project not having a lead and asked the group if someone from outside the Operations Committee could serve in that project

lead role? Steering Committee agreed that expertise from the wider tech community can serve as project leads and as temporary Operations Committee members.

It was suggested to send the agenda for Tech Operations Committee to the general WPLC announcements list or cross post on the same email lists as suggested for the surveys to get information on potential projects out and as a way to get interested experts to join.

5. Ongoing Discussion Items

a. Discussion: Develop an evaluation checklist

At the last meeting it was suggested that this group consider creating a proposal review checklist to evaluate proposals, the list could potentially include:

- Is there a project lead?
- Has a process for implementing the work been identified?
- Have systems/libraries been surveyed on current use or interest?

The group was asked if they want to develop a checklist and if so, what should be included in the list?

The committee decided to review a few proposals prior to developing a checklist. Steering will be looking at cost-benefits, impact, and other metrics to move proposals forward. The group will wait to see how the process works before developing anything more formalized.

6. New Discussion Items

a. Discussion: Collaborative Legacy Projects – Backup Collaboration Project

At the last meeting, the group decided to consider current, ongoing collaborative technology projects.

The group was asked the follow questions for consideration:

- Does the Tech Steering Committee want to take on this project?
- Do current stakeholders of the Backup Project want the governance to move to WPLC?
- What is the current status of project?
- Are there barriers or issues that the WPLC should consider regarding this project?
- What information would be needed to make a recommendation to the Board?

V. Teal-Lovely provided background on the project:

- Project status: They have the equipment and it is almost set up at the two host sites. COVID did slow the project down. Monarch will be the first partner (spoke) connecting to the hub. At the same time, they are talking with Recollection Wisconsin on the archives cold storage piece of the project.
- Stakeholders: There are 11 public library systems participating. 9 are only participating in the backup piece, 2 are just digitization only. 5 systems are not participating in the project.

- DPI has asked for a proposal for new LSTA funding. V. Teal-Lovely is putting together a proposal to give to DPI before the end of May.
- Governance: currently they have an MOU with each system participating, but no decision-making governance structure in place. Also there is no agreed upon budget, just replacement costs.

J. Thompson doesn't feel we need another governance structure for a specific project. He suggested to move this collaborative under the WPLC governance structure.

Concerns were raised about problems that would stem from voting partners who aren't project partners in a specific project. Decision-making structure could be integrated into the MOU with each project partner. It was noted that tech projects will continue to involve subsets of the WPLC, not all WPLC partners. Steering committee could serve as an advisory body to help establish the structure within each project's MOU and could advise on the project as it moves along.

It was asked if the WPLC board can vote on projects that not all board members are a participant in financially? J. Thompson suggested a project workgroup/lead brings a project budget to the Operations Committee who will then review and present it to the Technology Steering Committee. Steering takes it to the WPLC board who endorses the budget, with only project partners on WPLC approving the project budget.

As a next step, the group decided to develop a roadmap of the concept to embed in the backup collaborative MOU language. J. Thompson can work on putting something together with V. Teal-Lovely and bring in M. Van Pelt as needed. J. Gilderson-Duwe can help flesh this out. It will be brought back to the Steering Committee for review and approval.

Project managers were asked if there were any questions or concerns from a management perspective. M. Clark noted there weren't any concerns but wanted clarification on expectations for project management for the backup collaborative project. The group is unsure at this point. It is a group that has been in existence for a while and we would need to see how folding them into the WPLC structure would work first. J. Chamberlain mentioned that the Recollection Wisconsin digitization piece of this project could bring about a need for project management when it comes to that loading dock piece. There needs to be clarification as to whether Recollection Wisconsin is a partner, a service provider, or a project manager. There is a whole piece of that project that requires preparing those records for cold storage, not unlike a physical item archive. Recollection Wisconsin can play a role in developing, crafting and making that process happen. This is potentially being addressed in the LSTA grant proposal V. Teal-Lovely is working on for DPI.

It was suggested that a project like this may need to have two separate MOUs since there are two very distinct projects involved and project management should be considered in the budget development as well.

A possible project down the road is to create an MOU template for future collaborations going forward.

7. Committee information sharing and questions

It was suggested that at some point the group should have a conversation with DPI about potentially reserving an amount for undefined system collaborations that are consistent with PLSR recommendations, or something similar, when developing their 5-year plan. This would be easier for collaborations to apply for vs having to react to potential immediate requests from DPI. Those notifications of potential funds are wonderful, but hard to react to with little notice on a large collaboration scale.

8. Next Meeting Date: August 19, 2021 at 1:00 pm

Due to some conflicts, it was asked if the group could reschedule the next meeting. Project managers will send out a meeting poll to establish the next meeting.

The meeting ended at 4:22 pm.