



OSI Summit Group

Process Issues and Recommendations

Carrie Calder, William Gunn, Alexander Kohls, Joyce L. Ogburn, T. Scott Plutchak, Megan Wach

Abstract

The initial program for OSI2017 included time on Wednesday for each stakeholder group to elect or appoint representatives to an OSI summit group. The group would be empowered “to revise (as needed) the proposals developed by workgroups, and to prepare agreements and action plans built on these proposals after first consulting with relevant workgroups, delegate groups, and the full OSI group.”

1. Introduction

During the open discussion on Thursday morning there was consensus among the delegates that the formal governance structure proposed was premature. This eliminated the need for the summit group, at least for the time being. Several of those who had been elected (or volunteered) in our stakeholder sessions met on Thursday morning anyway as an initial informal advisory group. While we did not represent all the stakeholders, we touched on process issues that we think might have broad agreement among many of the delegates.

2. Process Issues

At this point, we are much less concerned with governance than with process – that is, coming up with ways to continue to engage people productively, particularly across stakeholder groups, throughout the year.

The email discussions are interesting but participation in these can be difficult and time consuming. It’s the nature of the forum that there are a flurry of emails depending on who has the time to respond and then within a day or two, the discussion is over. People who take longer to put their thoughts together or who would like to return to a topic tend to be left out.

3. Recommendations for Tools

There are a variety of tools available.

We have [Basecamp](#) accounts for the workgroups but it’s not clear how much use they’ve received for collaboration. They have not been used for other discussions.

The group talked about other tools that might include a variety of synchronous and asynchronous options. Making good use of these tools will require more structure. Megan suggested the [CUNY Academic Commons](#) as an example of a robust, multi-featured tool that might be useful for our purposes.

Perhaps we could organize monthly webinar sessions. Scott mentioned the [NIH's BD2K weekly seminar series](#) as one possible model. A brief presentation on a topic being investigated by one of the workgroups, followed by discussion would help to keep people engaged. Announcing topics of presentations and/or webinars could allow additional experts to join the conversation.

4. Conclusions

- Using these technologies effectively could also help to address the need to involve more researchers and more people from outside the U.S.
- Organizing these activities will require careful planning. A small group willing to commit themselves will need to be formed.
- Given the discussion about governance, we weren't entirely clear what the long-term prospects of the group would be.