Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Collaboration Steering Committee Notes
August 15, 2022 at 10:00 am

ATTENDEES: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Wyatt Ditzler (ALS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), Steve Heser (MCFLS), Karol Kennedy (BLS), Marla Sepnafski (WVLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), John Thompson (IFLS)

ABSENT: Bill Herman (DPI), Sherry Machones (NWLS)

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

1. **Call to order**
   Chair J. Gilderson-Duwe called the meeting to order at 10:01 am.

2. **Review Agenda – changes or additions**
   V. Teal Lovely requested an addition to the agenda, to update the committee on the development of a five-year project plan for the backup projects. J. Gilderson-Duwe suggested the item be added as agenda item 5.b.

3. **Approval of minutes –** May 9, 2022
   J. Thompson moved approval of the minutes, M. Sepnafski seconded. Motion carried.

4. **Reports: Committee/Workgroup Updates**
   a. WPLC Technology Operations Committee Meeting Notes – July 7, 2022.
      M. Clark gave a quick overview of the minutes from the last operations committee meeting. There were no questions from the committee on the report.

5. **New Discussion Items**
   a. **Discussion and action: Form Nominations Committee**
      It was noted the group needs to form a Nominations Committee that will solicit candidates for the Technology Collaborations Steering Chair for the upcoming 2023 calendar year.

      K. Anderson asked if the WPLC could consider a two-year chair cycle, along the lines of the recent decision to adjust the budget and recommendations process to a two-year cycle. M. Clark noted this would require a change in the WPLC bylaws.

      K. Anderson nominated J. Gilderson-Duwe for a second year as chair, J. Thompson seconded. J. Gilderson-Duwe accepted the nomination. Motion carried.

   b. **Update on Backup Collaborative Projects**
      V. Teal Lovely shared a planning document guiding the work of developing a five-year backup collaboration sustainability plan prompted by a request from B. Miller at DPI. Representatives from both back-up initiatives (digital archives and system back-up) will be working jointly on developing the long-range budget. A cost model is being developed with the concept of a flat participation fee plus an adjustable fee tied to the

amount of storage required by a participant. Next, V. Teal Lovely will be sharing this with the Tech-a-talka group at their annual meeting being held next week. The plan contains a running checklist of ongoing activities. Recollection Wisconsin representatives will be involved with the plan development. Recollection Wisconsin is also hoping to develop a pilot workflow for uploading content by the end of the year, with a model ready by the spring so other systems can start uploading their content. They will use SCLS as a test group for the pilot since that system's files are ready to go.

S. Heser thanked V. Teal Lovely for her work on a thorough plan.

J. Gilderson-Duwe asked V. Teal Lovely about the per-unit of data model and how it supports the development of a capital replacement fund. V. Teal Lovely concurred that this is a goal. There are two components to the fee; one is a flat rate for all participants that will support the ongoing maintenance, and the second is an adjustable fee based on storage use that will support the creation of a reserves fund.

J. Gilderson-Duwe would like to be mindful of how system staff time is being compensated. For now, most of this work has been in-kind. V. Teal Lovely pointed out that the planning document does reference technical support and project management, but there isn't a clear path on how to quantify this. V. Teal Lovely thanked J. Gilderson-Duwe for recognizing this unaccounted for labor. The recent LSTA award did support some staff time for R&D work. At the same time, there is an advantage of keeping this project affordable so we get widespread system buy-in and participation.

c. **Discussion and potential action: Moving Technology Projects Forward**
At the last meeting of the Tech Operations Committee, it was determined that the Deep Freeze project would be paused due to a lack of interest and project lead. It was noted that there may be systems interested, but they aren't on the Committee. It was suggested that the group and the Tech Steering Committee look at the membership of the Committee. Project managers also see a need for ownership of projects and propose joint Tech Steering and Operations committee meetings until projects become further developed.

Project managers shared their rationale for why joint meetings might help clarify the idea generation to implementation pipeline in order to move projects forward.

K. Kennedy likes the idea of having some joint meetings with more voices at the table. S. Heser agrees joint meetings could be helpful and suggested that perhaps a better model could be the steering committee giving the committee a task/directive. J. Gilderson-Duwe is not necessarily in favor of all meetings being joint, but perhaps when an idea is at a stage of readiness. K. Kennedy thinks we need to find ways to build buy-in on projects.

The topic of staff capacity among system IT was raised, particularly around complex projects like a statewide data dashboard. How do we gain the capacity to think about R&D? J. Gilderson-Duwe suggested there might be an opportunity to offset with some funding during the R&D stage. Traditionally, participants in innovative collaborations

have often been the same players due to staffing inequities at systems. By infusing staff capacity, we may be able to bring more ideas to the table.

Another systemic problem is how do we move a project forward without siphoning off system work. J. Gilderson-Duwe also expressed some concern about a model that relies on system administrators generating project ideas. The concept was for these ideas to bubble up from the subject matter experts on the Operations Committee.

S. Heser thinks it would be helpful to have a joint meeting and get more folks involved and on the same page.

The idea of prioritization resonated with K. Anderson. WRLS hasn't been able to prioritize this work, but that can shift. V. Teal Lovely expressed concern that when we experience a loss of leadership on a project, like in the case of the Deep Freeze exploration, progress halts.

J. Chamberlain asked if part of the problem is not having the right expertise at the table, how do we get the right people there? Might be an opportunity to improve communication.

K. Anderson asked if the group is trying to do too much at once. In an ideal scenario, J. Gilderson-Duwe feels we should have projects at different stages of development from exploration and initial concept through implementation.

J. Thompson used the example of the dashboard. In the case of IFLS, they have a solid homegrown product that can no longer be supported. It's time to start planning now for when that platform breaks. Their libraries view it as an essential service. J. Thompson suggests advocating at the state level for LSTA money to help high-priority collaborations. We need to identify projects where we need time or expertise to support a project. Those are the things we need to push up to a larger statewide grant. J. Thompson is in favor of a joint meeting.

V. Teal Lovely noted SCLS has a data dashboard, so they don't really need this project from the state. But SCLS could serve as a resource especially if there was funding to support staff expertise sharing. If there is a state offering, then there should be something in it for everyone.

The committee agreed by consensus to invite the Operations Committee to join the Steering Committee and do joint work first on the agenda. The Operations Committee could leave after those items if they'd like. We will pilot this at the next steering committee meeting, knowing that we can assess after the meeting if more joint meetings would be helpful.

J. Gilderson-Duwe suggested the agenda item be listed as "Joint review of outstanding collaborative IT project ideas and discussion about how to move them forward."

6. **Committee information sharing and questions**
    No information was shared.

7. **Next Meeting Date and Adjournment**
    The next meeting is on November 14, 2022, at 9:00 am

    The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 am.