

Minutes: 4 May 2016

Informal Business of the BoD

Attendees:

- Cameron
- Melissa
- Stephanie
- Paul
- Leslie
- Dave
- Ed
- Tim

Review Actions from previous meeting

Short recap of FORCE2016 (e.g., [survey results](#) as they are emerging)

- We received many positive responses from the evaluation form.
 - Attendees really enjoyed the interactive workshops and suggested that they could be extended to more than one day.
 - 60% said they would prefer the conference to occur every year, 33% said every two years.
- Cameron already received one request to co-locate the 2017 conference.
- Melissa's team is working on a lessons learned document. We should review this so we can apply FORCE2016's organizational efforts to future conferences.

Mission statement ([Community comments](#) and [synthesis from them](#))

- We received a variety of community feedback on the mission statement.
 - Where we are (following community input): "The mission of FORCE11 is to improve [*global*] research practices by supporting innovations in the ways [*researchers/humanity?*] we create and share knowledge across disciplines, *communities and timeframes*."
 - "We" is not clear here and is critical to our scope.
 - Laure suggested rephrasing to, "in the ways knowledge is created and shared across disciplines..."
- The third bullet in the mission statement should be made more explicit.

- Tim feels that we need to include “digital” within our statement or bullet points
- The bullets are not meant to be explicit, they don’t rule people or forms of communication out
 - Digital communication is something we do but not everything we do
- Third bullet changed to “effective digital communication methods.”
- Laure motions to move forward with the statement as it is (approve above version)
 - Time seconds
 - Group consensus reached

Board Code of conduct (draft version)

- This outlines what the responsibilities of the board are and how to exercise those responsibilities
 - Tim is proposing this document as an official code of conduct for the board
 - Paul’s comment on point six, “Should the default be open?”
 - Tim proposed that, by default, the board discussions are closed but we will publish the discussion summaries
- Melissa asks – what do we do if we don’t believe this code of conduct is being followed
 - This needs to be added
 - Handling issues internally within the board discussions does not always work. There should be an procedural element to handling issues.
 - Laure will find what Orcid uses and include it in the document
- The group is broadly satisfied with the document but would like to see a few refinements. We can work through this code in practice.

Report back on Funder discussions/sustainability (CN) (Summer school, scholarly commons)

- The advisory board encouraged us to explore all options in revenue generation
 - One possible form of revenue for the future is to help the set of funders in our space to coordinate between their different research groups. Cameron spoke to Chris __ & Josh __
 - Chris - The Moore foundation already has people doing this, not super interested
 - Josh - The Sloan foundation is more interested in this, wants to hear this framed in a different way so he could sell it
 - He is also interested in possibly sponsoring WGs and it would be easier to sell
 - Both saw FORCE11 as a critical part of the ecosystem that they need

- Combining different sustainability efforts that are not dependent on grants, would give us enough revenue to continue going
- Cameron asked the SCWG to prepare a document of their plans. The group could be a program with which FORCE11 proceeds....The WG will come back to us with a proposal on how to proceed
- Dan proposed a training program/summer school to engage students
 - Scholarly communications summer school – Canadian Digital Humanities has a very successful model
 - We have a proposal outlining what the summer school may look like, we're meeting on the 19th with UCSD
 - UCSD hosts the school but it's a FORCE11 program
 - The 2nd biggest digital humanities program is at Oxford – we should discuss this model as well

Working Groups

- [Ed's draft working points](#)
- The [current state of the Working Group subgroup](#)
- We will approve the two proposed WGs so they can proceed, and once we finalize the WG guide/principles, we'll ask them to submit any required documentation after finalization....(for example, explanation of the WG scope)
- Cameron would like to schedule a meeting to discuss the WGs
 - Wednesday, the 11th at 10