2018-02-23 Samvera Governance Working Group Meeting

Date
23 Feb 2018

Attendees

- Ryan Steans
- Rosalyn Metz
- Carolyn Caizzi
- Evviva Weinraub
- Nabeela Jaffer
- Maria Whitaker
- Simeon Warner
- Anna Headley
- Michele Mennielli
- Mark Bussey

Regrets

Goals

- Review outstanding discussion points in draft
- Review timeline: community review

Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fundraising update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>Outstanding discussion points</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dissent section: feel free to add your dissents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Steering: length of term; chair and chair-elect role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Partner Contributions: tiers or classification; incentive; votes for Steering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Components Council: Product owners for components, differs from CCWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Timeline and Community Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Final Approval of the model by Governance WG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community review: recorded webinar, comments(?), questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporate feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Time for components council and Mark B doing a fund-raising update

Mark B: Steering sent out a note about a 3 year ask - 1 year for this year, maybe 3 years after the new Governance model is in place.

Discussion Points about drafted governance model

R: Warming up to the big stuff - added a dissent section so that if someone really doesn't like something, have a space for marking that so we're transparent - and we can be anonymous

Steering - looking at length of term. Adding in Jess Hilt to review and how we look at how we bring people into new roles. Her input in this process may be useful.

Mic does a lot of this, too - we may already be in agreement

Pros - 3 years better longterm knowledge, Cons - will lose people

Evviva: 5 year terms - extended period of time for institutional knowledge to be passed down and internalized. 5 years is a long time, reduced to 3. Community manager ends up being institutional memory. 3 years is the minimum amount of time so we can roll people onto chair/vice-chair rotation. May be not tied to institution. Probably don't need to run special elections every year.
Mic - I prefer 3 year terms - provides continuity. Want new people, elections every 3 years. Give all of those people enough time, workflows, needs of community. 1/3rd of board every year, rotate every 3 years.

Maria - we have nine, 3 new every year

Mark - there can be more structure - pitched additional roles in community what a promotional and sustainable model looks like in community and not just among steering.

AI: As part of feedback schedule - schedule some folks to look at this during comment period - particular input on particular issues.

Assessment Section was added to be an opportunity for reviewing bylaws on a regular basis.

Community and ByLaws

Partner and Partner Contributions - Classification - contribution section

Contribution versus classification - some similar type of classification method - Artstore and Carnegie have been mentioned as classification mechanisms -

People contributing on what they can do or their FTEs? Emory has a high Carnegie Classification - the reality is that Emory has a staff total of 16 people. Staff in Emory libraries is far less than in other universities - DCE and others have no Carnegie classification - This is one possible model -

(should we throw this at the next group to actually nail this down?)

Capture some of the conversation we had - put it in in - but also put the questions we had on the page - Carnegie and Artstore, DuraSpace model, we have good relationships with our vendors but we can't guarantee all good relationships with people,

How do we know we're future proofing the community? How do we stop bad-actors from coming in and taking over? - (what is a partner in good standing? - financial, but maybe other values) Collection of money is happening through DuraSpace similarities of Samvera vs. Fedora contributions -

Is the $ value the same as the time from a person? Maybe the person's time is worth more than the $?

Maybe make that point the starting point for negotiation.

Not starting fresh - data for the past couple of years - look at what the vendors are contributing - any vendor could come in, but DCE (as ex:) is in good standing

Part of this is the money - we need the money - Mark - what do we need to sustain the programs we want to sustain. What is a contribution amount to put in?

Give opportunity to people to be a part of the project - effects the way you run fundraising campaign or membership campaign? Sell a value proposition - part of the project. What is the ROI for the entry level, and what is the return - what can we give back to the highest contributors? Engagement with a project with a vendor side of the project - might not give same opportunities to vendors as institutions. When we look at memberships - what is the value of being part of the project or idea more than the money value.

If we're going to pass the buck along (to set the levels) - we're passing it to steering. A working subgroup to take this on - to ensure better representation.

All partners get one vote - at partner votes

Probably need Partner in Good Standing language

Possibly weigh Partners voting by contribution level - Steering group is elected by organization - if votes are weighted in partners - can elect from a small group

AI: For today: 1 vote, 1 partner - that will be what happens now

Flesh out partners will flesh out the contributions to the community section - until Steering has a chance to look at financial incentives, will move forward with one vote for one partner

AI: Update formal contribution section as part of reason we would like to spend time on this

Principles we're identifying to guide a model

Components Council

Define Components

Council of Product Owners who worked to organize work cycles with the Technical Coordinator working on the roadmap -

Current Components Group - not the product owners in charge of these code bases -

Components Council isn't in conflict with their plan - but they aren't the same thing as what's currently happening (people doing coding, not PO's)

Components Council will be established - They are currently identifying PO's for each component

Steering should establish a method for establishing Permanent Working Groups -

Steering's ongoing activities, should be reviewed annually - should we establish that annually it gets looked at?
AI: should we create an Org Chart? Lay out how it will work

email asking everyone to +1 - resolve comments as I go through

Action items