ATTENDEES: Melissa Aro (DPI), Jennifer Bernetzke (SWLS), Erica Brewster (WVLS), Tim Drexler (SCLS), Anneliese Fink (MLS), Dominic Frandrup (Door County), Steve Heser (MCFLS), Kim Kieswetter (WiLS), Joshua Klingbeil (WVLS), Rob Nunez (KPL), Lori Roholt (IFLS), Shannon Schultz (DPI), Bruce Smith (DPI)

Meeting started at 1:00 pm

Agenda
1. Welcome and introductions
   The group was welcomed and introductions were made.

2. Project Background
   a. Overview – WPLC project managers shared that the WPLC Technology Collaboration has been laying the groundwork for a shared data dashboard project over the past 18 months or so. The Technology Operations Committee, comprised of technology practitioners from across public library systems, surveyed their colleagues statewide and engaged folks in an ongoing conversation on shared data technology needs. This work resulted in the development of a data dashboard specifications sheet, which was then shared with DPI folks, and it was suggested that a workgroup be formed to research potential dashboard solutions. At the same time, the Data Landscape report that was commissioned by DPI and drafted by WiLS reinforces the concept that a shared visualization tool, such as a data dashboard available to all libraries, could help library staff meet reporting requirements and facilitate data-driven decision-making. Because data competence and expertise vary among Wisconsin's librarians, a baseline tool can help bridge the gap in expertise from system to system and library to library. While some systems do provide a dashboard tool of some kind, there are concerns about product sustainability, ongoing support, and equitable access.

   In August, the WPLC Technology Steering Committee approved a project concept roadmap designed to guide this workgroup in evaluating readily available Wisconsin library dashboards as well as researching other potential solutions from outside of Wisconsin. By soliciting beta tester feedback, this workgroup is being asked to develop a recommendation for how we move forward in providing equitable data dashboard access for all public libraries, allowing systems with enhanced expertise to expand beyond this common framework.

   The project manager's role here is to facilitate meetings and help the workgroup connect with subject matter experts, as well as assist in drafting the final recommendation report.

   b. DPI involvement – B. Smith shared the goal of the Library Services Team for Wisconsin libraries related to a data dashboard. They would like to see a baseline established where all libraries have access to a dashboard tool or tools to better utilize available

data to inform their planning and decision-making and support their advocacy and marketing efforts. This goal of DPI is supported by the Data Landscape Study Findings and Recommendations; increasing access to data tools and expertise for libraries is part of the 5-year LSTA goals in our 2023-2027 plan; and the Division being charged in statute to work toward equitable access to data, tools, and support for all libraries

One thing DPI discussed with the Technology Steering and Operations Committees is clarifying "lanes" that are best for different stakeholders to focus on to align efforts to develop a high-quality data ecosystem for libraries:

- DPI – state level data collection (i.e. they aren't building a dashboard)
- Systems as WPLC – exploring the development of collaborative technology solution(s) to support access to and use of data as recommended in Operations Committee dashboard specs
- DPI Library Data Services Workgroup, Systems (data specialists and CE), WiLS and other partners – training, expertise support, and continuous improvement efforts (annual reporting, standards, etc.)

As far as DPI's involvement, they are providing $5,000 of 2023 LSTA Collaborative Data Project funds to support the project management time to facilitate this work group's efforts. In addition to that, Melissa Aro will be attending as the team's Data Analyst and the Statewide Data Coordinator. B. Smith will be attending as a process/project expert, listening for how we might support any next steps at the state level, i.e. LSTA, staff expertise, etc. He also provided advisory input to the Technology Steering Committee Chair, John Thompson, who developed the roadmap for the workgroup. The reason for proposing a statewide pilot as a result of the work group's effort is based on feedback that systems and libraries would need to see and have the opportunity to use a dashboard tool to understand its potential value, especially those without any kind of dashboard at this time. A pilot will also allow systems that already have a dashboard to assess whether it may be beneficial to be part of a cooperatively managed dashboard versus maintaining their own. The reasons for proposing that existing WI library dashboards be explored is that there has already been time and resources put into their development, and it may be easier to get a pilot launched within the proposed timeline.

Regarding the timeline, having a findings and recommendations report in March of next year from this workgroup aligns with various budget development timelines of the different stakeholders that could be involved in funding any next steps after June of 2024. The 2024 LSTA budget (July 24 to June 25) will be finalized during the 1st quarter. This is also when some systems will be starting their 2025 budget development process and the WPLC Board will be developing its budget to approve in June.

In addition, a pilot in the 2nd half of 2024 would allow a focus on demonstrating its use for budget advocacy, which may be a good way to encourage libraries to engage with the pilot dashboard to get good feedback to help determine potential next steps in the beginning of 2025 during the next budget development cycle.

DPI is encouraging and supportive of this WPLC effort to go from identifying this need to working together to find a specific solution or solutions to implement.

It was also noted that DPI has no predetermined ideas of what conclusions and recommendations this workgroup should come to or what DPI, would support and how. As John Thompson clarified when creating the road map, this is a concept investigation, not an actual development project.

The group's research and expertise, along with input gathered from a pilot, is what will inform any next steps that are decided within the WPLC governance process. DPI will engage with the Technology Steering Committee and WPLC Board as needed if/when those bodies seek input in regards to potential LSTA support for any next steps. Whatever is decided, DPI is appreciative of WPLC, WiLS, and all of the folks working together to seek a solution or solutions that can provide all Wisconsin libraries with access to a dashboard tool or tools to utilize available data better to plan, decide, and advocate.

M. Aro noted that as a subject matter expert, her role at these meetings is to help bridge the data-related needs of libraries and the feasibility of available technology solutions and to offer guidance related to current and past dashboard development within DPI.

She shared that searching for a single solution to meet all the needs of our libraries and systems is not realistic. Vendor products will continue to provide data visualization. Systems and libraries may maintain their own solutions. A well-built statewide solution representing data from all libraries and systems can work in tandem with local and vendor solutions. A data dictionary and common definitions will be an important part of maintaining cohesiveness between the statewide solution and local solutions.

M. Aro noted that the pilot should be treated as an information-gathering process, not as an initial phase in the development of the final solution. The selection of an existing dashboard tool for the pilot does not imply that the tool will be part of the proposed solution.

When DPI began the work on Public School dashboards, they focused on only a subset of assessment data and the MDAT tool. From the insight gained, DPI moved on to the vendor-sourced tool, which is behind the WISEdata portal currently. Through an iterative process with districts, the dashboards have expanded significantly over time to display statewide data and present value-added data and processes.

It was noted that during the pilot, this workgroup should focus on a limited set of data groups and metrics. Showing how a dashboard may add value to existing data, uncover relationships, hone questions, and inform narratives will allow the workgroup to gather feedback to propose a foundational solution. The group needs to deliberately steer discussion and evaluation during the pilot phase away from the selection of specific data elements and metrics.

It was asked if there were any questions about the information shared. A mind map document was shared about the expectations of the scope of this project. J. Klingbeil noted that the document is a WVLS internal overview of post-generation data life and

how the LEANWI roadmap might shift to accommodate a broader statewide collaborative effort.

3. [Project activities and timeline](#)
A timeline was created to help outline the activities and pacing of the project. The primary goal for this meeting is to get everyone on the same page, to divide the workgroup into two teams to do some research and evaluation of potential products, and to develop a shared set of criteria that both groups will use to do their evaluation. Between this meeting and the next, the two teams will explore dashboard options, bringing back in early November a clearer sense of which dashboards you'd like to explore and which dashboard(s) rise to the top. At the same time, a beta tester group will start to be assembled, and we'll need to determine how we want to engage that group and collect their feedback in November and December.

All of this work is aimed toward creating a recommendation in mid-January for a dashboard solution. Ideally, DPI can use the workgroup's feedback to help inform LSTA grant guidelines for next year should resources be needed for a statewide rollout.

It was asked if there were any questions.   It was asked the acronym SME stands for. It is Subject Matter Export. It was asked what the sandbox setup and workflow and how that compares to the pilot. It was clarified that the sandbox will be the option or time for this workgroup to look at and use a potential dashboard. The pilot would take place later on in 2024 that would be open to the rest of the WI library community to play with.

It was noted that the timeline is very tight and being able to look at both the user side and the backend in the current timeframe might not be feasible. B. Smith noted that the timeline was set up due to budgeting purposes of both LSTA and WPLC, but it could be flexible if need be. M. Aro noted that folks have been invited into the group that could show the backend of these dashboards.

D. Frandrup asked about the feasibility of incorporating all the different ILS's data into one dashboard. M. Aro reiterated that looking for a single solution to meet all the needs of all the libraries is unrealistic and that the group should focus on a limited and specific common data set.

4. Identify key evaluation criteria
Project managers shared that the group needs to develop a framework for comparing dashboards and also to help prioritize which solutions to explore further.

To get this work started, project managers pulled features and functionality that the Tech Operations committee identified in their Data Dashboard specifications sheet. [This list](#) contains both things that a dashboard should contain at a minimum, as well as nice-to-have features for future enhancements. It was shared that it is unlikely that any existing dashboard will contain all of the desired or wish-for features, so it's up to this workgroup to isolate which features are critical and which could be added down the road.

There are three existing dashboard platforms currently being used in Wisconsin libraries; those are listed in the form. The subject matter experts most familiar with each product were asked to

take an initial pass through this spreadsheet and conduct an inventory of their dashboard's features and functionality.

Once all elements of the evaluation form have been identified, a copy of this spreadsheet will be made for the research team to list additional dashboard products and undergo a similar exercise in inventorying features and identifying functionality.

The group was asked to look at the first section, Dashboard Elements. It was asked if anyone wanted any changes made to the current items listed or if anyone had any additions.

There was a question about interactivity and filtering. The group agreed to separate out those questions and add a specific question on filtering and grouping capabilities. The group also agreed to separate out the customization aspect by user and administrator. There was a discussion about separating out the elements of a dashboard into presentation and storage, but it was agreed to keep them combined.

The group then looked at the second section, Connected Data Sources. It was asked if there were any suggested changes or additions. The group agreed to add an "other" option.

The group then reviewed the third section, Support and Sustainability. A section was added on licensing discounts, proprietary or open source. It was also asked if there were any changes or additions. J. Klingbeil asked how the process of comparison should work. Should the group first look at the data? It was noted that examining the differing data points may need to be done in order to then look at the dashboard structures. It was reiterated that this project should be viewed as information gathering and that the group should focus on a limited set of data.

It was noted that the subject matter experts were encouraged to share as much information as possible when they do the inventory of their resources. It was noted that because the subject matter experts are a part of this project, the group can ask them for additional, clarifying information if needed in order to evaluate and compare the products.

5. Create task teams, assignments, and work plan (15 min)
   a. Existing Wisconsin Dashboards Review team (4 members)
   b. External Dashboards Research team (4 members)

   It was shared that in the timeline, project managers pre-assigned the subject matter experts. It was asked if anyone had a strong interest in one of the two teams.

   It was noted that regardless of which team you serve on, there will be an opportunity for everyone to share thoughts on any dashboard that rises to the top of the consideration list. Before the end of this meeting, it was noted that each groups next steps need to be determined, as well as how each group would like to work together between now and the next meeting.

   - Existing Wisconsin Dashboard Review Team
     - Rob Nunez
     - Dominic Frandrup

- o   Erica Brewster
- External Dashboards Research Team
  - o   Anneliese Fink
  - o   Jennifer Bernetzke
  - o   Lori Roholt

c. How does each team want to collaborate? Meetings or asynchronous? Basecamp?
It was asked if folks have thoughts on how they want to communicate with one another. Suggestions were via email, basecamp, or set up a worktime?

The SMEs were encouraged to take an initial shot at filling out the information about their organization's dashboard first before team members do their own evaluation. It was suggested that tabs could be added in the spreadsheet for each team member, or each member could make their own copy of the evaluation form and share it with the group.

For the external research, the group will work asynchronously on the documentation. M. Aro will send out research on existing external dashboards, and then the group will meet before the November 6th meeting.

The existing dashboard team will also begin asynchronously with the SMEs filling out the evaluation forms initially.

6. Upcoming Meeting Dates: November 6, 2023 at 1:00 pm