

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium**  
**Technology Collaboration Steering and Operations Committee Notes**  
**November 14, 2022 at 9:00 am**  
**via zoom\***

**ATTENDEES:** Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Keetra Baker (WLS), Wyatt Ditzler (ALS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), Eric Henry (MCFLS), Steve Hesser (MCFLS), Kerri Hilbelink (SCLS), Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Pete Hodge (WLS), Tony Kriskovich (NWLS), John Kronenburg (NFLS), Karol Kennedy (BLS), Walter Leifeld (WRLS), Sherry Machones (NWLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Lori Roholt (IFLS), Kris Schwartz (IFLS), Marla Sepnafski (WVLS), John Thompson (IFLS)

**ABSENT:** Bill Herman (DPI), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), Tou Yan (WRLS)

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

**Joint Meeting Agenda**

**1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at: 9:00 am.

The group was welcomed and introductions were made.

**2. Review Agenda – changes or additions**

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

**3. Discussion: Review of Roles and Processes**

J. Gilderson-Duwe noted the intention of the Operations committee was to build off the energy from the Tech-a-Talka, System IT meetings. A hope was to institutionalize those conversations and ideas.

K. Anderson noted the need to have the involvement of DPI in these technology conversations.

**4. Discussion: Moving Collaborative IT Projects Forward**

The group was presented with the following questions:

- Do the committees have the right membership?
  - How might we ensure we involve all of the interested stakeholders in projects?
- Does the work of these two committees overlap with other existing groups or stakeholders?
- What support do project leads need from the committees?
- What barriers exist for IT folks to lead a WPLC technology collaborative project?
- Are we using the right criteria to select projects?
- Is there a preference to limit the number of active projects?

The operations committee was asked for their opinion on the process and structure of the committees thus far. L. Roholt noted she felt that there were needs or concepts they were missing out on due to a lack of representation from some systems. J. Gilderson-Duwe noted that WLS had a similar conversation noting that some of the smaller systems that maybe only have one or two IT folks aren't able to attend. It was asked if there could be a proxy system of sorts

for some of those smaller systems. L. Roholt noted that most of the survey work that the committee has created reached most of the systems and more information could be gleaned from those.

M. Mercier would like to know more of what others are doing, more sharing could be beneficial.

K. Baker noted that there is room for improvement in communication among members.

J. Gilderson suggested reaching out to all system directors to assign an IT contact at each system, and project managers could reach out to them with questions in advance of meetings. The group currently has a standing agenda item on the agenda to ask about problems and IT-related pain points. Those questions could be front loaded on the agenda and potentially sent out to all systems in advance of meetings to gather thoughts and ideas from those that are unable to attend. Questions include:

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

K. Kennedy noted that the implementation piece is missing in this process flow chart.

It was noted that there hadn't been a project that has been carried through to fruition yet. It was suggested that formalizing the implementation piece would be beneficial.

K. Schwartz is involved in the backup project and noted that implementing and running technology projects is complex. With the backup project, it was originally thought it would be a simple, straightforward project. However, with IT projects there are so many unknowns making it difficult to jump into other collaborative projects. This may be the reason why many folks aren't willing to take the lead on new projects.

K. Schwartz noted that collaboration is still important, but suggested it is difficult to define what collaboration is, whether it is something where all systems are involved, just a few, etc. Do projects need to be something that all benefit from it?

It was noted that prioritization is essential.

K. Anderson asked if it was time to talk about incentivizing project leadership. It was suggested that the project leads could get a discount on the project, etc.

L. Roholt asked if we are limited to expertise in the groups. Is there an opportunity to access outside help?

It was suggested that this group could apply for LSTA grants for outside consulting, but systems are still going to be heavily involved in working out the details.

It was asked if there was a preference to limit the number of active projects. K. Schwartz noted that it is good to talk about multiple projects at once; having some on the back burner could be

beneficial. It was shared that one or two projects would be great, with a pipeline for future projects.

**5. Discussion: LSTA Data Landscape Project**

J. Chamberlain gave an update about an LSTA project that SWLS is conducting. This project, the "Wisconsin Data Landscape Study" is funded through LSTA monies and pairs both quantitative and qualitative data to gather information on staff's data competence (e.g. practical research/data skills obtained through academic and professional training), data confidence (e.g. self-reported comfort with engaging in data-related activities), as well as other data-related needs they might have in support of the development of a statewide report being released by DPI. The report will provide recommendations, driven by data gathered directly from public library and system staff, on what type of data-related resources and training opportunities public libraries need/want. This will be paired with consideration given to things like municipal size, staffing constraints, geographic limitations, etc. to promote equitable access to such opportunities while recognizing different libraries have different needs. The report will be released in Spring 2023 to provide one avenue of guidance for future spending on data-related resources and training across the state.

It was asked if public library or system staff would be surveyed. The survey will include both.

The group was encouraged to watch for that survey and contribute.

**6. Discussion: Determine Meeting Schedule**

It was suggested that one of the quarterly meetings of the bodies should be a joint meeting each year. The group agreed. Project managers will send out polls to determine 2023 meeting dates.

**Operations Committee Members Dismissed**

**Technology Steering Committee Agenda**

**7. Approval of minutes – [August 15, 2022](#)**

J. Thompson moved approval of the minutes and K. Kennedy seconded. Motion was approved unanimously.

**8. Discussion: Joint Meeting Debrief**

The group felt the meeting went well and noted it was important that the Operations Committee isn't alone in the project process. It was also very important to hear the struggles that IT staff have with taking the lead on new projects.

S. Machones had concerns about the interest from the Operations Committee about having the systems contacted about missing representation.

W. Ditzler has a unique perspective in that he is on the Steering Committee as a representative for ALS but is also a frontline IT worker for a library. He agreed that there should be more communication between systems.

It was noted that an ongoing investment from systems could help with sustainability.

J. Thompson asked if an additional staff member from DPI could join the meetings and noted that if they are looking at collaboration at the state level, there needs to be representation from DPI to help build collaboration.

M. Sepnafski noted that she felt the joint meeting went really well, and asked if there was a better time to have the joint meeting.

S. Hesper noted that the current structure of the committees seems to work.

As the liaison to the board for this committee, J. Gilderson-Duwe will give an update at the Board's next meeting.

**9. Committee information sharing and questions**

S. Hesper shared MCFLS migrated from a local to a hosted ILS.

**10. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment:**

Project managers will send out a poll to determine 2023 dates.