

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Collaboration
Joint Steering and Operations Committees**

Notes

November 7, 2023, 2:00 – 3:30 pm

via zoom*

ATTENDEES: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Melissa Aro (DPI), Keetra Baker (WLS), Erica Brewster (WVLS), Wyatt Ditzler (PLLS), Brian Durkee (OWLS), Eric Henry (MCFLS), Kerri Hilbelink (SCLS), Pete Hodge (WLS), Allison Hoffman (MLS), Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Karol Kennedy (BLS), Josh Klingbeil (WVLS), Tony Kriskovich (NWLS), John Kronenberg (NFLS), Joe Lawton (OWLS/NFLS), Walter Leifeld (WRLS), Sherry Machones (NWLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Lori Roholt (IFLS), Rebecca Scherer (MCLS), Kris Schwartz (IFLS), Marla Sepnafski (WVLS), Bradley Shipps (OWLS), Bruce Smith (DPI), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), John Thompson (IFLS), Margie Verhelst (MCLS)

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

1. Call to order & Welcome

Chair J. Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM

2. Review Agenda – changes or additions

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

3. Approval of Technology Steering Committee minutes – [August 2, 2023](#)

M. Sepnafski moved approval of the minutes; W. Ditzler seconded. Motion passed.

4. Reports: Committee/Workgroup Updates

a. WPLC Data Dashboard workgroup notes – [October 9, 2023](#)

J. Chamberlain noted that in addition to the October meeting, the workgroup met just yesterday to share their reviews of various dashboards. The workgroup researched several out-of-state dashboards and their ultimate conclusion there is that they aren't seeing any state solution that quite meets their needs. Most state dashboards only contain annual report data snapshots and the workgroup would like to find a more flexible and expandable tool for libraries to use. Their next step is to organize demonstrations of four current Wisconsin platforms. Those will be organized for later this month. The goal of the workgroup is to make a recommendation in February/March on a dashboard to pilot.

5. New Discussion Items

a. Discussion and potential action: October 16 Visioning Session Recap and Potential Changes to Technology Collaboration Governance

The WPLC Visioning session included a breakout table topic on Governance and Project Pipeline issues for the WPLC Technology Collaborative.

J. Thompson shared the results of the breakout table discussion, and some suggestions for how the Technology Collaborative might move forward to streamline project planning and decision-making.

J. Klingbeil noted that the Tech Talk group has had a lack of structure which has made it difficult to coordinate. To have a more proactive approach to collaboration and development, there needs to be more structure. On the other side, freedom with no structure is also helpful. If the group moves under the umbrella of the WPLC, there will always be the option for the tech talk group to fall back into its own group, format, and structure.

J. Kronenberg, echoed what J. Klingbeil said, and noted that at the last Tech Talk meeting, several folks agreed that the free-form structure that the group has is great. However, there was a concern that having to report to a committee or take directives from a committee would be concerning as they would lose that flexibility.

V. Teal Lovely noted that it really would be an open, informal structure for the Tech Talk group to optionally have virtual discussions in between the annual meetings. If there is something that that group would like to pursue further, a workgroup would be created. There would also potentially be liaisons from the Tech Steering Committee

J. Klingbeil agreed that there wouldn't be an obligation for the Tech Talk workgroup to report to the Steering Committee.

J. Thompson noted that all the projects in the hopper now (data, backups) had a champion who brought the project forward and worked with others with an invested interest. The Steering Committee would craft a group to move a plan forward.

It was asked how the Technology Steering Committee felt about converting the Backup Technology Steering and Digital Archives Backup Steering Committees to workgroups. It was noted that both committees have discussed this and agree that the move to workgroups would be beneficial as it would provide them more flexibility and they wouldn't have to operate under the constraints of a formal steering committee. Having a quorum in the past has been problematic. It would also allow the group to focus on the operations and could open up opportunities for the Technology Steering Committee to assist with budgeting and other issues.

V. Teal Lovely also noted that both those groups are ready to move onto more of a workgroup format.

It was asked how frequently this new community of practice would like to meet. K. Schwartz suggested maybe every other month, to begin with. He noted it was discussed at their last meeting that meeting once a year is not enough as ideas get lost.

K. Baker noted that monthly seemed like too much but every other month or quarterly would be better. W. Leifeld agreed.

J. Klingbeil asked the Operations Committee Members their thoughts on meeting frequency with the tasks that they have had. K. Schwartz felt that quarterly meetings were sometimes too frequent, but it depends upon the level of participation for those projects. K. Schwartz confirmed that work happened between meetings particularly for those leading a specific project.

J. Kronenberg noted that monthly would be too often.

It was agreed that every other month would be good for the new community of practice.

b. Discussion and potential action: Developing a structure/timeline/opportunity for cooperative purchases of popular software solutions

J. Klingbeil requested that this item be added to this agenda.

J. Klingbeil noted this came about from the idea to have more interactions for discussions about cooperative purchases. The new community of practice would meet this need; providing more frequent meetings will give more opportunities to discuss what everyone is using and find alignment on products and even on timing. Budgets, contracts, etc., could be discussed more frequently as well, allowing for more opportunities to find times to align product purchases.

It was asked if the Microsoft license issues were a reason for this. J. Klingbeil noted yes, that was a large part of it, but also the work that the Operations Committee did on Faronics. Being able to continuously revisit these topics will be helpful.

E. Henry pointed out that not just software but services, like the Infosec training, could be collaborated on.

Cooperative purchasing is one of the general topics that can be kept in mind and revisited at the community of practice meetings.

6. Form Nominations committee (to identify new chair)

Per the WPLC bylaws, steering committees need to form a nominations committee to select a chair and vice chair. Looking for 3 volunteers from the Steering committee to populate a nomination committee. We are a little behind schedule, but we can conduct an election for chair and vice chair via email before the end of the year.

“A Nominating Committee of a steering committee, consisting of no fewer than 3 committee members, shall be formed by September 1 of each year to nominate candidates for Chair and Vice Chair.”

Volunteers for the committee: M. Sepnafski, K. Kennedy, K. Anderson

K. Kennedy asked how frequently Technology Steering Committee members were recruited. It was noted that not all systems are represented on the Technology Steering Committee. Project managers will take that to the Board and ask for additional reps for the Steering Committee.

7. Committee information sharing and questions

It was asked what other potential projects systems see coming up. J. Thompson noted that data is still the biggest discussion point/concern within systems.

It was noted that there is an opportunity for the new community of practice to discuss and highlight the infosec service as a potential statewide project.

8. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment: A poll will be sent out shortly to set 2024 meeting dates

The meeting ended at: 3:07 PM.