2018-03-09 Samvera Governance WG Meeting notes

Date
09 Mar 2018

Attendees
- Ryan Steans
- Carolyn Caizzi
- Rosalyn Metz

Goals

Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House keeping</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Rosy, Ryan</td>
<td>Document on voting: <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/11pp_0H1xxK1dA6lY2aQhTX5B8RO3A_yFV3CeU0o/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/document/d/11pp_0H1xxK1dA6lY2aQhTX5B8RO3A_yFV3CeU0o/edit?usp=sharing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting discussion from week 03/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues with implementation of voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• what occurs when this is voted upon? A recommendation and show of support for the Doc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we determine what has passed the vote?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If it failed, what then? To Steering, but steering does what?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lazy consensus vs. single votes per institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Carolyn and Rosy</td>
<td>Review the feedback here: <a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1xxB6BSvJ9LiChO2ytc89XT9EGdM8620kxbxGxPV51/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1xxB6BSvJ9LiChO2ytc89XT9EGdM8620kxbxGxPV51/edit?usp=sharing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Categories of feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotation Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What to include</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How to include it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How to proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action items

- [ ] @

Meeting Notes

Voting - questions around lazy consensus.

Worst manager scenario - how do we handle how people vote a particular way for retribution from their managers.

Stronger appearance of consensus then there possibly is. Or people won't vote as members of their institutions.

Or a stronger appearance of conflict than there is

Anyone within an organization that's a partner - 150 people on the list - given this community

if there's a lot more -1's than we expected we need to go back with it
we can do an analysis of who is on the list - the list is known and finite

temperature can be skewed

small possibility of people not engaged -

No -1's -

Surface positions of individuals -

Jon Dunn - Lazy Consensus is fine for moving forward with the model - but when we're talking about dollars we need to look at a different voting mechanism

Identified concerns about consensus taking process -

If we went to a strict vote - a documentary, historical reasons - it would be useful to have a canonical vote from each institution

Concern is back to the democratic representation of the community versus an institution

Jon’s comments are indicative of Indiana, but not every institution is on the same page that way

In current Governance - Steering would have to accept and implement any changes - we're taking a referendum of Partners - does Partner Community ratify and want the Steering Group to move forward and make Governance changes

Vote is a consultation and recommendation

2/3rds of those responding - if someone doesn't respond, they aren't active in the community

Looking at Jon's comment - G16 -

Rather have us roll off 3 per year - does that's how enough good faith that we're willing to make a change? Addresses Simeon's issue -

Figuring out details can occur later -

Will there be a delay in steering making these changes or will they just do it

Some parts we can put a time line, some we can't

Voting for steering - people will respond to planning, etc... in their voting

Recommendation: What we're voting on is (a) to elect steering members and (b) to continue fleshing out the recommendations put forth

We talked about steering because we know it's key to getting those other things done

In parallel - legal work will need to occur (naming the institutions in the doc as steering) -

We don't invalidate community licensing by making changes - existing steering changes - few more councils weigh in - but they can change governance in any way they want.

The vote is for choosing partners to steering and electing partners

1. We request Steering to implement rec of electing body
2. Placing contribution requirements on partners (specific charter for a group to set contribution model that will be voted upon cash/ time)
3. Hiring centralized staff depending on funding
4. Establish more formal organization via a components council

If there was dollar tiering in this rec, couldn't support that - community contributions

Feedback falls into a few categories -

rec - vote would be a further fleshing on recommendations that probably exist

1. Steering is to be an elected body
2. Continue fleshing out the plan

Draft a paragraph - what we think this vote means - and mechanism

Draft paragraph 2 - that we will address the feedback

whatever role component council has will be voted on later - we have these areas we need to tackle

The working group will address these things - will ultimately be worked out with input from among the partners - each one of these things
we may tap you