

Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Collaboration Operations Committee Notes
July 11, 2023, 2:00 pm
via zoom

ATTENDEES: Keetra Baker (WLS), Tim Drexler (SCLS), Eric Henry (MCFLS), Bill Herman (DPI), Kerri Hilbelink (SCLS), Alison Hoffman (MLS), Pete Hodge (WLS), Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Josh Klingbeil (WVLS) Tony Kriskovich (NWLS), John Kronenburg (NFLS), Joe Lawton (OWLS), Walter Leifeld (WRLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Lori Roholt (IFLS), Kris Schwartz (IFLS)

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

Meeting started at 2:02 pm.

1. **Agenda Review - anything to add?**

There were no additions to the agenda.

2. **Project Update – Data Dashboard**

Both the Technology Steering and Operations Committees, as well as a small group representing both this and the Steering Committee, have spent several meetings discussing DPI's interest and role in data dashboard development and how we move the data dashboard project forward.

The group was given an update on the most recent discussions and outcomes from those meetings.

On June 7th, John Thompson (WPLC Technology Steering chair), Lori Roholt and Mellanie Mercier (WPLC Technology Operations Committee members), WPLC project managers, and several DPI staff members met to discuss the development of a data summit to serve as a mechanism to advance a statewide data dashboard project. DPI initially suggested a data summit gathering as a next step - however, upon further consideration after hearing feedback from WPLC Technology Collaborative members, DPI and representatives from WPLC agree that a data summit is not the right direction at this point in time.

A second meeting on June 27th resulted in the following suggestions:

- A need to fine-tune the Technology Collaborative pathway from project ideation to implementation (project managers can take the lead on developing some alternate scenarios).
- A need to develop a conceptual roadmap for the data dashboard project - John Thompson has volunteered to work on this.
 - Suggested elements include:
 - A research phase - what tools are out there and being used by other states or consortia, what tools do we have homegrown in the state that might be ready for testing.
 - A sandbox phase - could we roll out a baseline tool/platform for folks to kick the tires, to help define what we like, don't like, need, want, and don't want in a tool. This initial tool won't have the full functionality of

what is laid out in the data spec sheet, but it can be used as a data-gathering exercise.

- A gathering or summit to learn what people liked, didn't like, etc., in the sandbox tool and compare that to the information gathered in the research phase.
- Re-examining the Tech Collaborative structure in the hopes of formalizing a workflow/process for collaborative projects:
 - Better define committee roles, such as:
 - Operations ideates, info shares, comes up with potential projects
 - Steering fleshes out viable projects into formal proposals and develops the project plan and budgets
 - Board endorses the project, approves funding, and charges the formation of a workgroup
 - An implementation workgroup makes the magic happen
 - Utilize the October WPLC visioning session to get feedback on any recommended changes to the tech collaborative structure
- In terms of next steps, the Operations Committee needs to review and affirm their support in taking the data dashboard project proposal to the Steering Committee for official review, approval of the concept/need, and then a review of a proposed roadmap for moving this project forward.

J. Chamberlain shared a draft roadmap created by John Thompson.

3. Action: Data Dashboard project proposal

The Committee reviewed the [data dashboard proposal](#) to submit to the Technology Collaborative Steering Committee.

L. Roholt noted that this is ambitious and will be a very involved, complicated process but is in support of submitting the proposal to the Steering Committee.

J. Klingbeil noted that much of the focus is on the data consumption side, but the more challenging aspect to tackle is the transferring and storage of the data, and this should be brought to the surface earlier in the plan.

The group was asked if they approved moving the proposal onto the Steering Committee.

J. Klingbeil noted that without any other major projects to put forth, data makes sense to push on and asked what other major project(s) might end up being slowed or blocked if Data has priority and attention for the next 6 months to a year.

It was noted that the Technology Operations Committee would still work on the development of any projects that arise.

There was a consensus to send the proposal to the Technology Steering Committee.

4. Idea Sharing

Systems can share project ideas, announcements, or questions live in the meeting or via the [Google form](#).

The group was asked the following:

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

The group reviewed the [system-wide tech questionnaire for any submissions](#). There were none.

T. Drexler shared that SCLS has created a [fast-fact dashboard](#) that compiles information from the DPI reports that include information from all libraries in the state and can be accessed by all. It is not interactive but has all information and is broken down by county.

J. Klingbeil shared that WVLS libraries using hotspots funded by ACF? Libraries are preparing to either stop providing the hotspots or pay for them and asked what other systems are doing.

B. Herman shared that the chair of the FCC is changing eRate eligibility, and hotspots may be included as an eligible service.

J. Kronenburg uses Verizon for their cellphone plans and noted that Kajeet hotspots could be used with Verizon for \$15 per month with unlimited data. The hotspot model they have can use Verizon network with no modifications.

W. Leifeld asked about the Deep Freeze survey and ask if we could compare, as systems, more of the software that is used by systems, and use that for volume pricing/cooperative purchasing.

It was noted that the project lead for the Deep Freeze project left their current system, and the prices that were offered for the cooperative purchase were higher than some systems were paying.

It was also noted that a statewide survey that this body updates and maintains contains much information on software used by each system.

At the next meeting, the group will discuss the survey and add information, if necessary.

P. Hodge let the group know that they are moving to Microsoft Defender for antivirus.

In response to W. Leifeld's question about identify software solutions for cooperative purchasing, J. Klingbeil is curious where and when is the opportunity for systems to start discussions about larger cooperative purchases of software solutions? Is it at budgeting time? Or at the annual tech talk meeting? Or in this group? Current practice seems to be serendipitously, when two or more systems happen to have a shared need at the same time. But could there be the development of a more intentional timeline for building cooperative contracts for shared software? This question could be a future agenda item, perhaps at the November joint steering and operations committees' meeting.

Next meeting date: November 7, 2023, at 2:00 pm (joint meeting with Steering)

Meeting ended at 3:17 pm