Scholarly Commons Steering Committee Meeting
November 10, 2015

Participants: Jeroen Bosman, Ian Bruno, Robin Champieux, Chris Chapman, Stephanie Hagstrom, Cassie Kling, Bianca Kramer, Maryann Martone (chair), Dan O'Donnell

Regrets: Amy Buckland, Sarah Callaghan

AGENDA

1) Open Science Framework: recap of call with Brian Nosek
2) ORCID; recap from ORCID meeting
   a) General theme: everyone was very optimistic, positive
      i) Validated idea that the Scholarly Commons effort is necessary
      ii) Maryann had breakfast with Brook Rosenzweig of Helmsley – if we accomplish what we proposed in this grant, Helmsley would be willing to fund outreach and more opportunities for community engagement
4) Steering Committee (SC) - should we add more.
   a) We can draw from Sarah’s 1K challenge proposal www.force11.org/node/6212
5) Workshop 1 - Establish Steering Committee for this event
   https://docs.google.com/document/d/1AViXjEDwMcfLV9qA395brfBogZCgkKYCT1Tlzc9l-qo
   a) When? – February 2016 would be more practical than January
   b) Where? Meeting Ideas
      https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pt9l8Yl21prbmkeZDgUxfoL6hCW5znxz5xi1QUCuHQ4/edit
      i) Tone of Leslie’s email was wrong for the futures workshop. It said technology isn’t really an aspect of FORCE11 but FORCE11 is about technology
     ii) Consensus of the last SC meeting was that the workshop should be held in a non-Anglo Saxon country, or at least, not the US
        (1) Having it in the US or UK and inviting members from developing countries would force those members participate on our terms
           (a) Outside the US would allow for a freer, more equal conversation
           (b) We have enough funding to hold it in a lower-income country
           (c) It would send a strong message to have our first workshop outside the US
        iii) We don’t want current barriers creeping into this meeting – would be a factor for a futures workshop
        (1) The logistics of getting everyone to a meeting in a lower income country would be much more difficult – attendance would lower
        (2) Having it in the Anglo-sphere will maximize the workshop participation
           (a) Bianca will be meeting many international delegates this week - she could get a feel on people’s opinion on this
iv) It is important to involve lower income minority communities (LIMC) – Caribbean locations could be an epicenter for Latin American participation
   (1) We could hold it in a place like Miami – it’s accessible to Latin American countries
      (a) Since Helmsley is a US-funder, we don’t want to overload on the cost of hosting it somewhere other than the US
         (i) Symbolically, it would be important to have meeting in Caribbean area
      (b) It does not need to be held at a university, it could be a rented space instead

v) **Action:** The group will investigate a limited number of locations further: Miami, Buenos Aires, Athens, East Asia (perhaps Hong Kong or India)
   (1) If we consider Europe or US, it should probably be in southern parts due to weather
   (2) We should talk to Scott Edmunds for recommendations on Asian locations
   (3) **Action:** Post question to FORCE11 discussion forum and tweet about it to gather thoughts/feedback

**c) Who? – Invite List**

i) Number?
   (1) Minimum 40, Maximum 60?
      (a) Group agreed that no more than 60 would be best
      (b) Main thing we want to have at the first meeting is representation – if we include all of the people we’ve been discussing, we can reach 50 easily

ii) Invitee list
   (1) Thought leaders: we don’t want simply the same people we usually have, especially we are encouraging international participation
      (a) Should even emphasize people outside of academia (e.g. Wikimedia)
      (b) We should keep in mind that we can invite different people to each meeting
   (2) Criteria for selecting invitees
      (a) The attendee should be able to talk/think freely, without an agenda
         (i) How deeply does an invitee need to know the scholarship vs. the technology?
      (b) How many need to be scholars themselves? 50%
         (i) We want seasoned scholars but also young ones
         (ii) Early career researchers – should tap into this group
            1. We could offer travel scholarship to students
      (c) Passion to change the system without grumbling
      (d) Representation across fields
      (e) We need to make sure that we engage people that may not be well know (for example, students and postdocs who have formed their own journal clubs, or informal organizations, etc.)
         (i) They don’t have an international voice but they do possess relevant knowledge and opinions
         (ii) How would we identify these people?
            1. Nomination process
            2. An open call
(iii) **Action**: Robin will articulate this group further with plans on how we can access them

(f) Program modeled on JDDCP
   (i) We should look at other groups that have made similar declarations, charters, etc. – this is a set of people who should attend
   1. **Action**: Bianca and Jeroen will review their list

(3) **Summary**: Targeting 40-60, heavy representation from scholars (those producing scholarly content) with a portion of this group representing “hidden gems,” percentage that is not scholar driven (deep thinkers outside of academia but can speak freely), representation across different fields,
   (a) We can ask for additional recommendations from invitees

(4) **Action**: formalize the criteria to evaluate invitees

d) **How?**
   i) Are we going to be the SC for the first workshop rather than bring in others?
   (1) We should broaden the group – the current SC is too small at the moment
   (2) We could issue a call saying that we’re planning the workshop and invite people to join – if there are a lot of people, we may need to separate into sub groups
   (a) Make sure to describe the different workshops in the call
   (b) We want to attract people who have a passion for structuring the workshop
   (c) Ask what they are interested in and why they want to participate
   (d) **Action**: issue call for volunteers on FORCE11 website
      (i) Idea of time/effort needed:
         1. The meeting will end at the end of Feb.
         2. It may be two days long
         3. Will be a fair amount of intense work right after the holidays with weekly conference calls
   
   ii) Format – day of meeting
      (1) We’ll have to be very creative
      (2) Model off of Dagstuhl Perspectives Workshop
         (a) Seemed like an effective and efficient method of discussion, produced outcomes
         (b) The workshop established ground rules – people needed to know what they were designing and what was out of bounds
      (3) Are there people who could help us with this, i.e., facilitators?
         (a) Would be useful to have interviews with facilitator candidates
         (b) The meeting needs to be facilitated but if we come up with something very creative, we may need to have a training session for the facilitator prior to the workshop
         (c) Alec Gunn – had a sense of fun around him in the way that he runs meetings
            (i) Maryann can contact him if the group would like

6) **Review Action Items from previous meetings**
   [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DpER9RRHsxFos84vvNyUD9efS1XRHVWK_apM_YLE9Pg/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DpER9RRHsxFos84vvNyUD9efS1XRHVWK_apM_YLE9Pg/edit?usp=sharing)