

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Collaboration Operations Committee Notes
October 19, 2021 at 10:00 am
via zoom**

ATTENDEES: Keetra Baker (WLS), Pete Hodge (WLS), Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Tony Kriskovich (NWLS), John Kronenburg (NFLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Robert Nitsch (MLS), Lori Roholt (IFLS), Kris Schwartz (IFLS), Tom Teska (SCLS)

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

Meeting started at 10:00 am.

1. 2021 System Tech and ILS Survey

The committee reviewed the survey that was out in the field in August. It is updated and available if anyone wants to review the survey. Most systems completed it. We can make sure it is updated annually or every two years. We did add some new questions including any suggestions for statewide technology collaborations. Some ideas offered included EZ Proxy and statewide software or database cooperative purchases.

2. Project Update – Deep Freeze

M. Clark gave an update on the presentation R. Nitsch gave to the technology steering committee. The tech steering committee gave the green light to pursue this project. R. Nitsch shared the spreadsheet with pricing from Faronics with 1, 3, and 5-year pricing. IFLS, WVLS, NWLS and Milwaukee are the only systems that would see a price increase in a cooperative purchase. All other systems would see a savings. R. Nitsch believes he can negotiate better pricing. WRLS offered staff to assist with this negotiation. There is a Deep Freeze cloud option, but that adds complexity to the project statewide. R. Nitsch would like to set up a demo of the cloud connect and the cloud premium so systems can see this product in action. Steering committee meets November 2, so if R. Nitsch has anything he would like to share, he should let M. Clark know. Next steps are for R. Nitsch to pick a date and time and set up a demo. M. Clark can record the session & share if they allow it.

3. Project Follow Up – Data Dashboard

M. Clark asked the committee if they have suggestions for additions to the survey. She asked the group to suggest additions to the list of data elements they would like to see included in a data dashboard. K. Schwartz suggested adding computer use as another data point. P. Hodge also suggested adding print management (ie: from PaperCut).

M. Clark asked what should this project look like? What phases should be included? This project is different from the Deep Freeze cooperative purchase. This is larger scale and more complex. One dashboard per system, or multiple dashboards within systems? L. Roholt doesn't have a strong preference if it is one or multiple. Key desired attributes are that the dashboard is automated and as close to real-time as possible. Jody from SCLS reached out to L. Roholt with her statewide data visualization projects, however hers are not automated – a lot of data gathering on the back-end. SCLS uses Tableau public. M. Clark is wondering if we need to do a vendor platform exploration phase. K. Schwartz agrees this would need to be something

contracted out to a vendor. IFLS has an aging dashboard and looking to create something different. M. Clark walked the committee through the survey to ensure we have the right questions. L. Roholt suggested we better describe the concept of a dashboard so everyone is working on same definition. J. Chamberlain asked if we wanted to get a sense of why people would like a real-time dashboard – include a question on how a system would utilize or for what purposes. Primarily a dashboard would serve monthly data needs for directors working with local boards. But it is a tool for library staff and directors. Project managers will make changes to the survey, send to committee for review, and then out in the field later this month. From there, the committee can determine if this project is worth pursuing and then enter into the research phase.

4. Project Follow Up – EZ Proxy

M. Clark recapped the conversation with DPI from last meeting. We are looking for ideas on how to move forward and would like to identify a project lead. K. Baker is interested in investigating this further. Winnefox uses EZ Proxy for their libraries and have found it simple to administer and manage. Statewide scope would be big and complex, but she thinks it is worth exploring. M. Clark asked if we should follow similar path to the data dashboard, first by sending out a survey to see who are using EZ Proxy or other authentication platforms. Reminder that EZ Proxy did come up in the recent System Tech & ILS survey. It was suggested to add a question on the EZ Proxy survey re: how many resources a system would need to run through the authentication system. M. Clark will probably deploy this survey in December to avoid having too many surveys out there at once.

5. Idea Sharing

No committee members had anything to share. Additionally, M. Clark did not receive any new project suggestions in the idea submission form.

Next meeting date TBD – M. Clark will be sending out a meeting poll to get next year's meetings scheduled.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:49 am.