

2015-09-18 Steering Group Minutes

September 18, 2015, 1 PM EST

Attendees

Steering Group Members

Paul Albert, Jon Corson-Rikert ★, Melissa Haendel, Dean B. Krafft, Robert H. McDonald, Eric Meeks, Andi Ogier, Bart Ragon, Julia Trimmer, Alex Viggio

★ = note taker

Ex officio

Jonathan Markow, Mike Conlon, debra hanken kurtz

Regrets

Kristi Holmes

DIAL-IN: 641-715-3650, Participant code: 117433#

Agenda

	Item	Time	Facilitator	Notes
1	Updates	5 min	All	
2	Review agenda	2 min	All	Revise, reorder if needed
3	Sub group for asset recommendations	10 min	Mike	Would like to have 3-4 people review and recommend priorities regarding assets. See Asset Inventory and Recommendations Task Force
4	Sub group for in-kind contributions and membership levels	15 min	Mike	Develop proposal for Steering Group review. See VIVO Project Charter v 1.1
5	Implementation Documentation Task Force	20 min	Julia	See Planning a VIVO Implementation
6	Future topics	5 min	All	attribution/contribution efforts (10/16); training program; rotation of Steering Group members

Notes

1. Updates
 - a. [Unknown User \(gtriggs\)](#) starts this Monday, September 21. Graham will join the Steering Group email list and calls next week.
 - b. [D-Lib magazine article regarding the VIVO Conference](#) – thanks to Carol for her writing. Thanks also to [Kristi Holmes](#) and [Melissa Haendel](#) for organizing a great conference.
 - c. Second Outreach and Engagement call held this past Tuesday. Very good attendance (9), discussion. See [2015-09-15 Outreach Call](#).
 - d. UF publishing VIVO data on GitHub. See <http://senrabc.github.io/vivo/2015/09/17/All-University-Of-Florida-Papers-Published-Given-Year.html> – about 6,000 papers per year
 - e. Alex is planning to leave Symplectic at the end of the month, but is very interested in remaining on the VIVO steering group and active in the community; his plans for next steps won't be set for a couple weeks but will definitely include VIVO, and he's eager to help with the Conference since it will be in Denver.
 - f. Ontology event has been postponed.
2. Review Agenda
 - a. no comments or questions
3. Sub group for asset recommendations
 - a. Have a subset of Steering review the report and its recommendations and refine the response to indicate priority and timing
 - b. Some recommendations may need further exploration and/or a task force to enact
 - c. Several people (Alex, Jon, Paul, Mike) on Steering worked on the report – so would be good to have a different group review the report with perhaps one overlapping person
 - d. Thinking of 1-2 phone calls as the scope
 - e. Julia, Robert, Ted happy to help; others welcome to volunteer by email and Mike will contact more people mid-week if additional volunteers needed
 - f. Would be a good orientation exercise for Graham
4. Sub group for in-kind contributions and membership levels
 - a. We indicated at the Leadership meeting at the conference that we would have a proposal for the November meeting – Steering should be done with discussion of any proposal before the end of October
 - b. Our charter describes membership at various levels and holds out the opportunity for in-kind contribution that could count in some way toward membership level
 - c. This has led to a variety of interpretations and to lack of clarity – would benefit from examples in the charter, and there are examples from the field of contributions both from institutions that have made financial contributions and those that have not
 - d. The original concept in the charter may vary from one Duraspace project to another, although some policies are necessary DuraSpace-wide

- i. Paying at certain membership levels gets you certain benefits, but most institutions are more interested in influence on the direction of the project – e.g., to have a seat on the Leadership Group to affect major strategic direction and budget
 - ii. Can also be elected by peers from among lower levels of membership
 - iii. The other path is to contribute at least half of an FTE to the project over a year – doesn't confer membership but is a path to Leadership
 - 1. That means that one or more persons put in aggregate a half FTE
 - 2. Requires making a plan with the Project Director
 - 3. Effort needs to take direction from the project, on tasks determined by the project – has to be work for the common good and usable
 - a. Normally directed by the tech lead
 - iv. Half of an FTE is worth more than \$20K cash so arguments have been made on the Fedora project that .5 FTE should also confer membership status, but opinions differ
 - v. Projects have the right to customize policies if consistent with the general framework
 - e. Key concept there is that the in-kind contribution is under the direction of the project, not focused on the local institution
 - i. According to current policy, the reward is a seat on the Leadership Group, not a membership level
 - ii. We don't have examples of that; Very few examples in any projects, and we are trying to create more incentives for institutions to contribute time of their employees
 - f. Fedora runs that way – they have sprints, and people sign up for sprints – but very few institutions can contribute .5 FTE
 - i. A 6-month period has been divided up into 2-week sprints, and institutions can commit developers to sprints
 - ii. The rate of participation has diminished over time – some discussion of whether it would be easier or more fruitful to hire contractors
 - 1. Easier to get commitments to new feature development than maintenance or bug fixes
 - iii. Fedora is looking at other ways and exploring other incentives
 - g. Some have volunteered quite a lot of time to the conference and ontology work, and including \$30-40K of research funds on the ontology, as well as having a small contribution as a member
 - i. There's a lot of work beyond the software – and in the case of the ontology, it's broader even than VIVO (includes eagle-i and other domains of interest)
 - ii. For any institution it will be an individual mix of both what can be contributed and what is of interest
 - h. We can consider conference work, documentation, and other tasks
 - i. But the criterion of having the work mediated by the project leadership is important
 - i. Should every membership level have some expectation of in-kind contribution – we don't want to discourage institutions or people who are already doing in-kind contribution while also paying
 - i. It may be easier to develop a sliding scale where institutions can change the mix but are expected to contribute some of both types of contribution
 - j. Would it be useful to have a group look at this issue across projects?
 - i. VIVO has some unique needs and types of contributions
 - ii. Other projects also won't fit the pure developer mode as well
 - iii. With Fedora and DSpace there would be another issue that comes in – the concept of split membership, with some going to VIVO or DSpace or Fedora
 - 1. That's a valid issue but not what we're trying to solve here
 - 2. The goal of the model is to encourage participation, and now we're even at risk of generating ill will because people feel unrecognized when effort is contributed
 - 3. Encouraging participation is also encouraging membership
 - iv. We should have conversations at the project level before trying to do so DuraSpace wide – each project will bring different thoughts and constraints
 - k. Participants? – Dean, Jonathan, Robert, Eric
 - i. Mike would be comfortable receiving recommendations from this group and would appreciate doing so
 - ii. Melissa is happy to review recommendations
 - iii. Jonathan will organize calls
5. Implementation documentation task force (Julia)
- a. Started work back in March – Violeta asked Julia and Damaris to revise the Planning a VIVO Implementation part of the wiki, and added Brian Lowe, Paul Albert, Alvin Hutchinson, and Benjamin Gross
 - b. Met biweekly; first identified pain points in their own implementations and worked with Google docs
 - c. A lot of existential challenges initially around scope and what they were writing
 - d. Violeta and Damaris worked on a diagram at the bottom of the Planning a VIVO Implementation wiki, covering project management, technical, outreach and engagement, and data management
 - e. Existing pages were plugged into one of those 4 groups and organized into the stage of the process – (analysis, pilot, implementation, staging, release)
 - f. Came up with two versions of the structure and got some feedback; finished up in July
 - g. Involvement ebbed and flowed but people returned – helpful to have the goal of the conference as an end date
 - h. Mike – recommends the diagram to the group – the concept of an enterprise application that uses enterprise data and provides it to the institution
 - i. needs the right components to be able to deliver
 - ii. [blocked URL \(https://wiki.duraspace.org/x/KI4pB\)](https://wiki.duraspace.org/x/KI4pB)
 - iii. Very important for people to understand the level of commitment needed before embarking with unrealistic expectations
 - i. Weaving in new content and weaving in a container to hold it and make it more coherent – Violeta deserves a lot of the credit
 - i. Helpful for the Duke team to see how working on a community project differs from a Duke project
 - j. Kudos!
6. Future topics
- a. Please get topics to consider on the list; we have proposed having special meetings where we set aside an hour to go over a substantial project
 - i. We have such a meeting set up for October on attribution and
 - ii. Mike would like us to get back to discussing the strategy of getting bigger – there's a long adoption and implementation cycle, but we want to see the numbers of sites running VIVO to go up
 - 1. We'd love to get from 28 sites in production to 50 and then 100
 - 2. What does everything have to look like for us to be able to grow – environment, technology, etc.
 - 3. We could then have that kind of discussion at the Leadership meeting – how does VIVO become the obvious choice for representing the scholarship at your institution
 - b. No volunteers for attending the euroCRIS meeting yet, so Mike will follow up with the specific people we talked about in the last meeting

Action Items

- Mike will convene the asset review sub group
- Jonathan will convene the in-kind contribution sub group
- Mike will reach out to possible participants in the EuroCris event
- Graham will join the call next week