

FORCE11 Board of Directors Retreat

January 16-17, 2016 in Boston, MA

AGENDA

Saturday Morning:

9:00 am – 9:30 am

Check in: what do people want to have done/resolved? Ground rules, ways to address/record issues during the retreat (e.g., record issues for further discussion, discuss how to follow through). No laptop/phone rule. (Cameron)

- Kick-off meeting – Cameron
 - o Offer for Board volunteers
 - As it stands, Laure has offered to be secretary, Tim will stay on as Treasurer, Dan will be vice president, Cameron will be president. Election will happen by email, following the retreat, which is not a formal Board meeting.
 - o Hopes for the weekend:
 - Achieve a shared sense of goals and agreement on what FORCE11 is
 - Create a list of items that need to be resolved
 - Decide how we will approach changes and merge different perspectives
 - Important to respect everyone’s ideas/perspectives
 - Standard practice for the Board should be to recognize disagreements and handle them professionally; outwardly show comradery
 - The Board should focus on communication and shouldn’t feel pressured to rush
 - Board members should trust each other enough so that we can act independently in the best interest of FORCE11
 - o Consensus isn’t necessary, but be flexible enough to not stifle creativity
- What would everyone like to get out of this meeting?
 - o Cameron – group to have a shared sense of what FORCE11 is and a list of items that let us achieve that vision.
 - o Tim – get a better understanding of where we all come from and what we want to accomplish; find common ground.
 - o Dave – obtain a sense of what the future looks like.
 - o Paul – get a sense of where we want to go and leave excited about FORCE11.
 - o Dan – maintain FORCE11 excitement and see FORCE11 become more comfortable with itself to achieve successful scholarly communication. Our one weakness is a lack of communication/openness to all ideas without losing track of productivity.
 - o Leslie – future is already here, it’s just not evenly distributed – would like to focus on that.
 - o Ed – emphasis on “hack & yack” approach, increased fusion of important goals for the future, be open to ideas, learn to be an effective distributed organization with open channels of discussion.

- o Melissa – discover the function of the organization to affect change in scholarly communication. What is the organization going to do to help these processes along? How does FORCE11 function internally – what is everyone’s role?
- o Laure – develop trust, understand the role of the board, and find money for Stephanie.
- o Anita – agrees with all of the above! Address/explore the evolution of FORCE11. How do we become facilitators to involve more people and how can we work towards normalization?
- o Stephanie – understand what FORCE11 is - what is the sound bite that’s going out to the community. Find a clear mission. How is FORCE11 valuable to the community?
- o Maryann – find disconnect of what’s going on in FORCE11 - why might it be perceived as insular? Second Stephanie’s thoughts. Build trust within the community. Answer how are we held accountable. Discover shared goals, promote a healthy organization, and learn how FORCE11 should properly function. Ensure that past contributions are not diminished. Share experiences and contribute to the conversation.

9:30 am – 10:30 am

Past: where do we come from? What were some of the ideas that drove Force11? What was the magic/excitement and what were some of the ideas? (Ed, Tim, Anita)

- Beavers reshape landscapes, much like FORCE11
 - o Once beavers transform their surrounding ecological environment, they leave and start anew somewhere else
- Anita’s background – grew up loving science as a cultural artifact. Realized the importance of appreciating and promoting science’s role. Should not be exclusive but open to all – promote scientific communication
 - o Anita’s early days at Elsevier – when arXiv became popularly used, they anticipated the death of publications
 - Beginning of the increased availability of scientific knowledge
 - o In 2003, organized meeting to change the format of scientific publishing
 - Scholarly communication builds on what came before – how can we obtain a bird’s eye view of this process?
 - o We then looked at scholarly communication from an international perspective
 - Recognized that there are other methods of doing things for different people - there isn’t one norm.
 - Create structures that support diverse, independent development
 - o Met Ed in 2006 – discussed how to make new form of communication happen
 - Set challenges, have everyone submit suggestions to challenge and discuss how to make it work
 - Asked how to improve scholarly communication? Received 71 submissions and sorted out the top ten
 - Invited the ten groups to Boston, MA to present their ideas
 - o Incited a spark of how effective and productive communicating ideas can be
 - This brought about the first Beyond the PDF conference in 2011
 - o [Beyond the PDF](#) - January 19-21, 2011 at UC San Diego

- Phil Bourne gathered a great group of people – discussed reshaping research communication
- Presented different talks about different topics (e.g., annotation, provenance, peer review, etc.)
 - Showed changes in the way people communicate (emails, the internet) but a lack of change in how research is communicated
 - Explored how research communication could change in this new world and how science could be advanced
 - Set up new infrastructure to increase the rate of change
- Produced the [Manifesto](#)
- We achieved a lot in the effort of shaping and changing the scholarly landscape
 - We want to reinvent how scholarly communities work
 - Rethink how we hold conferences, how to make them less elite, less structured, include students and early career researchers, reinvent presentations
 - Reinvent how scholarly communities interact and optimally contribute to science
 - The way we communicate science is not good enough. For example, when we perform research, often the results are not reproducible in the industry or pharmaceutical research
 - Maryann – at Dagstuhl, it was apparent that the technology side (software tools, etc.) is just as non-reproducible as laboratory research
 - Melissa – important to also show the positive results of this research. There are positive outcomes as well as negative.
 - It's important to bring together all of the small groups producing exciting results.
 - That's what FORCE11 is in its current form – sort of an incubator for small groups to work together.
 - We can focus on the good and recognize that good things are happenings but also realize that a lot of excitement does center around the current problems in the system
- Ed – Review of FORCE11 history and approaches to the future
 - In Ed's world, the publishers do not control anything; researchers are free to share their papers however.
 - We need to learn how to use the best current technology in the best way – promote creativity to improve the future (ORCID is a great example of this practice).
 - We can create a space for innovation and introduce the parties (facilitate communication between parties).
 - How have our past predictions been realized today?
 - Where are the hinge points to produce change?
 - Code citation
 - Annotation
 - [Hypothesis](#) – like many initiatives, they started with no resources and waited for the resources to present themselves
 - FORCE11 provided a space for Hypothes.is
 - Annotation belongs to not one group but FORCE11 can bridge multiple groups
 - There are a lot of people working on projects but they do not have branding opportunities – FORCE11 can also provide this

- o Groups don't work for FORCE11 but through FORCE11
 - WC3 work
 - Altmetrics
 - o We need to think strategically and propose questions. It is not our job to solve the questions but can propose them to the community and wait for them to work towards a solution.
 - We must make communication more effective.
 - o Three questions to address:
 - How do we identify strategic choke points/hinge points?
 - How do we connect multiple groups to be more productive? Link together groups that are working on similar things.
 - How do we encourage groups to work with us?
- Cameron – Do the new Board members have a broader sense of FORCE11's origin?
 - o Laure – biggest question: how wedded is this organization to its history and do we want to evolve?
 - The FORCE11 Manifesto is very wedded to paper. How do we expose the conversation throughout research?
 - o Tim – Ed's review shows that at any one time, approaches that we thought would work may not turn out to work.
 - o Leslie – how to make the harm more visible?
 - o Melissa – concerned about FORCE11 as it does not feel welcoming. How to fix this problem? May simply be due to the rapid growth of FORCE11 as an organization but we need to strike the right balance between being involved in FORCE11 and becoming subsumed in FORCE11. We can make better utilization of librarians – don't alienate them.
 - Anita - Criticism is justified; help us find positive ways to bring about change. Our actions are not intentionally meant to harm/hurt; we just go about things the way we always have. What should we do differently?
 - Dan – as FORCE11 expands, it runs into different disciplinary methods. As we encounter these different norms, we assume that everyone works the same way. We need to learn how to interact with different approaches and create a medium.
 - Maryann – if you enter this interdisciplinary mix, expect your norms/constructs to be challenged. We need to also realize that FORCE11 does not speak for one particular group; the feelings of one person may not be representative of the entire group. Be aware that issues are complex but FORCE11 is open for discussion.

11:00 am – 12:00 pm

Manifesto: how relevant is this still? Does this need to be updated, where do we take it? (Paul)

- How do we approach the manifesto and is it still relevant?
 - o Melissa – it doesn't make sense to keep manifesto as a living document but we should keep it as a learning point as something to reference.
- Paul proposed four options: 1) attempt to revise it, 2) make an entirely new one, 3) do nothing, or 4) declare some sort of victory.
 - o Laure – consider it as a historical document. Don't change the document itself.
 - o Melissa – the manifesto is still valuable as a corpus of discussion
 - o Ed - Status of the manifesto - what is it?

- Dan – it's an historical document. It responds to things that at the time were important/pressing. We shouldn't tie ourselves to the manifesto as that discourages change.
 - Dave – supports Paul's proposal of declaring success; manifesto captures a moment in time and shouldn't constrain our vision for the future.
- o Paul – consensus is to consider it an historical document
- o Cameron – we can reflect on it as an historical document
 - Laure – this is a big decision. Is this a time when we record a vote instead? Does it need a formal process or can it be approached informally?
 - Maryann – should we include the community in this decision?
 - Tim – no one would dispute that it's an historical document. What we should discuss is the FORCE11 model of working groups and providing a framework for collaboration. We need to write a mission/vision statement and create a strategic evaluation of the landscape, not a manifesto.
 - Cameron – This is not a formal meeting of the board (in respect to the bylaws), we can choose to make it a formal meeting.
 - Proposal: this is a document that exists and we as a group can agree that it is fine as it stands with no need to rewrite it.
 - o Anita – happy to leave it as it is but we may want to use the summary to help define our vision. It will be important to refer to it but we can create a strategic reassessment of the landscape.
- o Cameron – Is the sense of the room the creation of a vision/mission statement, clarification of what we do, and what FORCE11 is?
 - Leslie –We can consider what aspects of the Manifesto still hold. It would be a good opportunity for community input.
 - Ed – what is the purpose of our actions? Why do we need a vision statement? We already have something similar to a vision statement on the website but a strategic assessment is something we need.
 - Cameron – I feel that a well crafted mission statement is a useful tool for making those strategic assessments/decisions
 - Dave – A mission statement would also play an important role in having community involvement
 - Tim – the website says that FORCE11 is group of people interested in furthering the goals of the FORCE11 manifesto.
 - o Maybe we should craft this differently first?
- o Paul categorized the group's Manifesto comments in eight areas
 - Have we achieved the manifesto within or without FORCE11?
 - Incentives in community - draws on business model questions
 - Discussion of various forms of tooling – comes back to our success with the manifesto
 - Have we achieved reusability?
 - Research objects – what are they, are we making progress?
 - Visibility of the working groups
 - Bold stances – commentary in scholarly communication. Should FORCE11 make bold stances, how to handle advocacy.
 - Quality metrics – manifesto has very little to say about this topic
- o Manifesto table – displays problems and proposed solutions

- Recommendation for 2.1 – one should rethink the unit and form of scholarly communication – have we achieved this?
 - Ed, Melissa – better question would be what has happened to address these problems, not have we solved these issues.
 - Dan – we reconcile these aspects by asking if we’ve worked on them or not.
- For most issues, we’ve succeeded more or less.
- Leslie – if we want to evaluate our progress properly, we should realize that there is never an achieved end/solution but we can make differences and realize how to move from one point to another
 - Laure – we are here to learn what the FORCE11 BOD is supposed to be doing. We cannot foster these conversations until we realize who we are and what our role is.
 - o Dan – we’re moving towards this. We should be thinking about action items as an outcome of our afternoon discussions.
 - Proposal – more formally discuss our next steps and come to a consensus. Create deliverables that we’ll legally enact as a conclusion to the meeting.
 - Maryann – are we past the level of arising organically (as the website states)?
 - See Stephanie’s “The Association Growth Curve” slide - FORCE11 seems to be entering phase two Normative
 - o Paul proposed to drop the manifesto discussion, it is important that we read it but it does not need to factor into today’s discussion too heavily
- Cameron – The purpose of this afternoon is to address/resolve issues
 - o Important that everyone hears about the working groups (WGs) as they’re crucial to FORCE11 – keep WG discussion on the agenda
 - o Also discuss vision statement – it’s not our responsibility to ratify but it is our role to test the changes and then bring these to the community
 - o Paul – important to also achieve concrete actionable items as a result of this meeting.
 - Cameron - we will break into groups this afternoon to create action items to bring to the bigger group when reconvened
 - For example, how do we choose to support new WGs
 - o Maryann - Important to understand why FORCE11 WGs are successful to capitalize and reproduce it.
- Anita – 6 emerging topics
 - o Vision – Why are we here, what do we stand for?
 - o Content – what is it that we’ll do?
 - o Process – how we’ll do it?
 - o Community – how do we work as a community?
 - o Communication - how do we communicate internally/externally?
 - o Sustainability – how do we stay afloat?
- Group agrees that if we have a proposed formal action today, we’ll call a formal board meeting
 - o Bylaws state that BOD members need at least 48 hours notice of an upcoming BOD meeting

12:00 pm – 1:00 pm

Lunch + email time.

Saturday afternoon

1:00 pm – 2:00 pm

Talk about what was done in the working groups – thoughts on what went well, what should change, etc. (Maryann, Dan)

- FORCE11 hosts 23 WGs (both active and completed)
- Biggest change in WGs came from Merce Crosas's \$1K challenge
 - o Collaborative tools used were mostly Google Docs, etc.
 - o We could set up a group webpage but the website was limited to little else
 - o The DCIP WG led to Stephanie's new WG setup
 - o Groups wanted to come together, hosted by an organization but not run by an organization – perfect fit for FORCE11
 - Our goal was to inform what WGs should adhere to without imposition. We provided organizational backing.
 - RRID WG – the groups were working outside of FORCE11 but realized that through FORCE11 they received different responses from the publishers and community members
 - o The WG produced a paper and an available, implementable standard
 - Sustainability WG
 - Approached by Moore foundation and received funding
 - Created a sustainability committee and composed a report
 - Interested parties, clear goal, produced outcome
 - Data citation dissemination
 - Commons WG
 - Meant to ferret out what was happening in the Data Citation Principles
 - Scholarly Commons WG
 - Submitted proposal to Helmsley – first grant that came to FORCE11 as an organization
 - You can visit [the website](#) and see a synopsis of work going on in this realm to provide a conceptual landscape
- Some WGs elevate into programs (for example, DCIP and the SCWG) and some WGs have little activity or the activity occurs outside of FORCE11
 - o Broad, open ended WGs tended not to be as successful (for example, Software Citation – they broke up into two WGs after realizing the initial obstacle was to decide what the WG was supposed to do)
 - o By declaring a WG, we can find out if a WG was needed at all
- When one wants to form a WG – we consider what they want to produce/provide to the community/landscape
 - o We need to give WGs a chance to develop, to discuss, to understand goals, and so on before we judge their merit.
 - However, we do need resources to sustain the WGs.
 - If a WG really wants to be successful, we need to offer some sort of support or the WG needs to find support themselves

- o If FORCE11 provides that support, the group will need to come to us with the appropriate funding
- Laure - What kind of conversation/outcomes are we trying to foster with the WGs and what is a timeline? We need to be conscience of success metrics.
 - Maryann - These conversations are critical, WGs can have closed mailing lists but can have open forums if they choose
 - Melissa – the intended outcomes of each WG can be very different, we just need to define them.
 - o Maryann – the title needs to reflect this definition/purpose.
 - Anita - Different outcomes matter to different people
- o Leslie – endorsement policy: if there is a WG and they encounter a legal conflict, to what extent is F11 responsible for that?
 - **Action: address this through liability insurance**
 - Cameron – there is conflict between responsibility and how to take credit.
- o Paul – we have multiple types of support structures for different groups, we should have these support structures listed and instructions for obtaining them.
 - **Action: this process should be made clearer**
- o Tim – How do we monitor the WG progress? We need groups to tell us what their intentions are at the beginning so we can determine how to evaluate its progress.
 - Dan – the WG leaders should have to report on their progress

2:00 pm – 2:30 pm

Discuss issues raised during the morning (or continue in a larger group, if there are no [or only one] clear topics); what do we want to focus the rest of the retreat on? (Anita)

- Use Anita's themes and discuss in break out groups

2:30 pm – 3:30 pm

Break into groups and discuss these issues

3:30 pm – 4:00 pm

Rest and email break

4:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Report back on issues to full group and decide on next steps

- Process
 - o The group considered the different tasks that FORCE11 does (e.g., planning events, setting up WGs)
 - o Identified the top 8 actions for FORCE11 to complete (prioritized in order):
 - Insurance for the Board
 - Define roles, responsibilities, services of WGs
 - Define the relationship between FORCE11 and the FORCE conferences - expectations around the conference and problems about planning
 - Need to understand sustainability, create a business plan

- Develop welcome packs (for members, Board members, advisory board members, WG members)
 - Create an organization chart (necessary for business plan)
 - Define the procedure surrounding neutrality (FORCE11 is supposed to be a “neutral” organization – how to implement this)
 - Board code of conduct (must be able to have fun)
 - Crowns to support the advisory board
 - o Cameron – interacting with different publishers is very political, how do we go about this?
 - Dan – FORCE11 is a common meeting place which implies “safe space”
 - Paul – “Safe space” concept should be added to our neutrality stance
- Vision
 - o We should use the resources we have (words) and aim for clarity on concessions
 - Realize that FORCE11 does not/cannot mean the same thing to everyone, not the same value/utility
 - o Values:
 - You are not a passive participant
 - Inclusivity
 - Critical (constructively)
 - Create a safe place where people can be challenged; expect to be uncomfortable
 - Melissa – bring different communities together. Can we have some sort of recipe for resolving issues?
 - o Paul – welcome packs could assist with this
 - o Ed – It’s not something we can solve now, but we can certainly work on it via WGs, discussion forums, sessions.
 - o Dan – we need to learn how to extinguish fires and how to do it quickly. Reduce the chance for misunderstanding with a code of conduct.
 - Global
 - An enthusiastic exoskeleton
- Strategic Directions/Content (also see [Ed’s notes](#))
 - o Formats and channels of communication – how does information get packaged and disseminated
 - o Medium of communication
 - o New forms of formal judgments
 - o Credit and attribution – copyright and ownership
 - o Rewards and incentives
 - o Degrees of which raw information as it comes from the source has been processed and reprocessed
 - o Outreach and social license
 - o Interdisciplinary methods/ways of thought
 - o In the mission statement, the above items could be considered to be within FORCE11’s scope
 - Anita – identify our ideals and find gaps in our current thinking. Discover where we can make the biggest impact.
 - Leslie – FORCE11 can provide a mechanism to enable the above items to happen. Would contribute to our mission statement.
 - Maryann – Citizen scientists, journalists – having an outreach campaign to identify these people would allow them to be integrated into this fabric.

- Communication & Community
 - o Communication:
 - Welcome packs
 - Make FORCE11 more interactive throughout the process
 - Encourage increased social network communication - promotes better sense of activity across the organization
 - Member spotlight/recognition
 - Crowdsourcing content for newsletter – set up communication committee
 - Multiple channels of communication (list serves, Twitter, Slack)
 - Working groups should email updates to everyone
 - Post newsletters on the website
 - Establish a communication committee
 - Leadership meeting
 - Community outreach (i.e., FORCE11 ambassadors to other groups)
 - o Community (see [group interaction map](#)):
 - Evaluation of activities – how do the groups relate to one another
 - We need to be aware of what’s happening in different groups. The ambassadors could report on this.
 - FORCE11 reporters – support students to attend conferences and write a report
 - o Anita – A FORCE11 sustaining member could support one student reporter for something in return.
 - o Establish a FORCE11 Fellowship?
- Sustainability
 - o Core funding
 - Define value proposition (based on mission/vision)
 - Define budget (staffing, etc.)
 - Develop core funding
 - Grant to hire consultant
 - Re-start Board WG on sustainability to accomplish the 3 items above
 - Business plan & fundraising
 - Fundraising includes conference profit

5:30 pm

Close: need to put questions on the poster before you are allowed to leave! (Cameron)

- Identify 3 items you most want to address (refer to poster in 2016 Boston [Notes folder](#))

Sunday Morning

8:00 am - 9:00 am

Breakfast; discuss questions on posters (Sustainability, Vision/Mission, Process, Communication, smaller related clusters)

- Cameron – two things struck me: how strongly the questions are clustered and how many people clustered their own notes
 - o The clusters are Board subcommittees – all clusters contain issues that need to be addressed. We need to figure out how to accomplish these.

- o We can include the advisory board as well
- o We should create a set of issues that we can discuss within WGs
- Board members should initial at least two committees on the poster that they will join (can include advisory board members)
 - o Ensure that there is a mix of old and new Board members
 - o **Action: drop next Friday's meeting (January 22, 2016) to allow time for the groups to gather and create a concrete, one page document with solutions**
- Break out into groups to discuss what can be delivered in three weeks and report back:
 - o Paul – Process (Paul is chairing the Process subcommittee)
 - We will draft five documents:
 - List of process issues
 - Identify what is a working group
 - Working group charter
 - Organizational chart
 - o Will be a picture with labeled entities and relationship issues addressed
 - Board way of working (i.e., when are the BOD meetings, are notes public by default, etc.)
 - Laure – make sure to reference the bylaws and update them as needed
 - **Action: Stephanie will create folders for each committee in the Board Google Drive**
 - Dan – is there an assets list?
 - o This will be included in welcome pack to new Board members
 - o Anita – Mission/vision
 - We agreed to do following three things:
 - Appoint communications subcommittee and brief them on what we need them to do. For example:
 - o Work on FORCE2016 conference
 - o Develop a long term FORCE11 communication plan
 - o Solve list serv problem to communicate to membership
 - Develop starter packs for new Board members, WGs, etc. – define what are the starter packs and who will write them
 - Teach communities best practice of communications
 - o We could give students facilitation training to understand how groups and meetings work (professional development) and train people in communication (blogging, presentation skills)
 - Could bring students in to FORCE2016 a day early for a workshop
 - Leslie – we could require that they write a blog post
 - o Cameron – we could offer a service of being able to recognize when there is a lack of diversity and how to involve a diverse community.
 - o Laure - Sustainability
 - We need a strong commitment from the board that core funding is important and that it's something we should pursue
 - One of the best ways to achieve continuity is through staff
 - Create a value proposition

- Stephanie, Tim, and Laure will create a 2016 and 2017 cash flow analysis (NIH DCIP WG funding is not applicable) and come back to the board with a plan.
- Compose a proposal for Helmsley and Sloan
 - We'll decide what to approach Helmsley for and whether we should approach Sloan for funding –
- In three weeks, we want to achieve better visibility of how to proceed.
 - Cameron – we'll have solid continuing basis.
- Laure requested an accountant to assist with the budget and cash flow analysis (will most likely be less than \$1K).
- **Tim moves for Board to declare that it is in favor of and will commit to taking the steps necessary to raise funds for staff support on a continuing basis as a serious organization (includes Laure's request for accountant support)**
 - **Paul seconds**
 - **All are in favor**
 - **Maryann abstains**
- Dave - Vision/mission (see [Dave's notes](#)) – Ed chairs committee
 - In three weeks, we aim to produce:
 - A concise vision statement
 - Should include an ethics section
 - Revision of guiding principles
 - Strategy implementation headlines
 - Statement of value proposition (tentative)
- **Action: use the Board mailing list to inform everyone of what's happening between groups**

9:00 am - 10:00 am

Sustainability efforts and budget issues (Stephanie, Tim)

- Refer to Financials section in Retreat Booklet
- Operating budget
 - Two different accounts: NIH DCIP WG account through UC San Diego and a Bank of America account.
 - Helmsley & NIH are paying in to our operating budget to cover Stephanie, Cassie, and Josh Utley (web master)
 - No sustaining members are included in the budget
- Grants
 - NIH bioCADDIE subcontract through UCSD for FORCE11 DCIP WG
 - Workshop budget – supports Scholarly Commons WG & DCIP WG workshops
 - SCWG budget includes \$69,000 for a programmer to build visualization tool (not yet hired and most likely a contractor)
 - DCIP WG budget breakdown is according to NIH categorization
 - NGN is UC San Diego telephone overhead
 - \$30K to support other WGs
 - Software Citation WG and Attribution WG
 - No specific FORCE11 grants, we live on grant overhead and conference profit
 - Dan – FORCE11 currently depends on people's ability to bring in money; it's tied into specific people

- Anita – we need to put out a stronger message that FORCE11 is capable of securing funds as an organization instead of on an individual level
 - Tim – we need to apply for a specific grant to fund FORCE11. We are too dependent on WG grants but keep in mind that this has only been happening for the past year.
 - Ed – are the funding organizations okay with covering staff costs with the grant?
 - Stephanie – this is not out of line with any other project grant we've submitted and we can provide the submitted budgets, if necessary.
 - o Maryann - Helmsley wanted their grant to be through FORCE11
 - o Anita - Do they know that they're supporting F11 as an organization? Are the two funders (Helmsley and NIH) aware that they are the main funders for the organization?
 - Stephanie - Yes, we sent the full FORCE11 financials to both Helmsley and NIH
 - Maryann – Stephanie is a subcontractor at FORCE11 (FORCE11 buys her time from UCSD).
- Expenses
- o Expenses include ReadyTalk calls with Board, internet (we have twelve domain names – one for each conference), web hosting, P.O. box, DNO, office supplies, \$1K attorney cost (should be increased), annual tax filing (we need to audit our books this year, add money to this).
 - ReadyTalk - \$2K
 - Dan – we could donate call in numbers?
 - o We have about 7-8 calls per week; would be difficult to coordinate with different numbers.
 - o Maryann – we could also offload some of the cost to Skype and Google Hangouts
 - Cameron – ReadyTalk is not great for international calls
 - Staffing costs include a monthly retainer for Josh and hourly pay. Cassie is 50% to FORCE11 and Stephanie is 80%.
 - Conference travel
 - Exhibit booths – should we have a presence at conferences?
 - Maryann has attended conferences on behalf of FORCE11
 - Anita – Elsevier has many marketing people that could possibly participate for free; could assemble a marketing plan.
 - o **Action: Cameron, Anita, Leslie, and Melissa will have a conversation about this.**
 - o Laure - communications committee of the board – we can bring in people from the Board or have outside people handle communication regarding conferences and events.
 - o We run out of money in August 2016
 - Without money, we have a website but no staffing or ReadyTalk
 - **Action: we need to put together a cash flow budget, expenses, revenue, etc. and then return for a conversation about money**
 - Stephanie – will report on how much money we need to raise to keep going and an idea of our core funding
 - o Cameron – it's important to give a clear idea of where FORCE11 stands, especially for the new Board members

- Sustainability:
 - o Laure – Our current sustainability model is not a sustainability plan. There's not a current plan, only options. We need to be much clearer to ensure FORCE11's success.
 - Leslie – it would be wise to hire a consultant to take on this responsibility.
 - Paul – Agreed, the problem is the expense.
 - Maryann – Sloan and others have indicated that they would provide funding for this.
 - Cameron – Proposal yesterday was to reconvene sustainability group and to hire expert support to finalize it
 - o Laure – is the whole Board doing this or is it a WG or a subgroup of the Board?
 - **Action: establish a sustainability group that will be a committee of the Board that recruits community members.**

10:00 am -11:00 am

Next steps: what can we do within the next year to realize some of the outcomes of the retreat?

- See above action items.

11:00 am -12:30 pm

Planning, task list and next steps

- **Action: follow up with the SCWG to determine how to handle another grant**
- Leslie – we need to address the endorsement policy. If there is a WG and they encounter a legal conflict, to what extent is FORCE11 responsible?
 - o **Action: get insurance for the Board.**
- FORCE2016 – Melissa
 - o Specific requests
 - We're on our third publicity chair. We need help with publicity.
 - We also have to cope with a competing conference.
 - Someone in Leslie's group will assist with the marketing/publicity campaign.
 - o We can pay for this out of the FORCE2016 budget.
 - Dan – Please send the exact FORCE2016 verbiage for the Board members to post and publicize.
 - o **Action: Stephanie and Melissa will follow up on this.**
 - o Laure – when the workshops are released, will help publicize them.
 - The conference publicity committee will morph into the Board publicity committee.
 - o Committee currently has 5-6 members.
 - Melissa asks all Board members to make personal contacts and invite them to the conference
- Elections
 - o Would anyone like to nominate themselves or others for current positions? Or are there concerns about the current arrangement?
 - Dan can continue as vice president, but ultimately he plans to step down.
 - The terms for each chair are two years.

- Dan – Bylaws state that president position has to be from an elected member of the Board
 - This has not been voted on; bylaws are still to be ratified.
- No objections to current chairs.
- If anyone has any other concerns or action suggestions, please send them to Cameron and he will address them.

< Meeting adjourned >

1:00 pm

Lunch at Marliave Restaurant.