

2025-05-26 Coordinators check-in meeting

Attendees: Andy, Ash, Av, Daniel, Matt, Paul, +1

Andy's notes

Report from yesterday's meeting: we didn't end up doing the walk-through, nor did we get through most of our agenda, so in lieu of notes, here is a summary of the questions 7 of us spent about 2 hrs talking about, which we now turn over to you:

the goal of the directorship/coordination restructuring this winter was to create specific roles and decision making processes so the working groups could have relative autonomy, and space management was left to those who expressed the commitment and capability to handle top-level tasks. in many ways this has worked fine, and we all have a lot to be proud of: dozens of self managed working groups call woodbine home.

what's concerned many is the idea that woodbine is headed towards a crossroads between collectivity and hierarchy. Perhaps as a result, the participatory inertia that led to the directors/coordinators reorganization has only grown among the woodbine community, and the ranks of directors are shrinking due to a perceived resentment.

in discussions with some of you, i have insisted that directorship was never meant to be small as 5, and that it could and would likely expand. We are still open to this. Matt has suggested the distribution of specific titled roles to coordinators (see the project manager proposal earlier in the thread), and my suggestion is that these roles be taken on as part of an expanded directorship. Failing this, the space could move towards an institutionalized non-profit, in which these roles would be taken on in a more official and professionalized capacity.

in discussions with some of you, i have insisted that directorship was never meant to be small as 5, and that it could and would likely expand. We are still open to this. Matt has suggested the distribution of specific titled roles to coordinators (see the project manager proposal earlier in the thread), and my suggestion is that these roles be taken on as part of an expanded directorship. Failing this, the space could move towards an institutionalized non-profit, in which these roles would be taken on in a more official and professionalized capacity.

Over the course of the discussion last night, some expressed they liked the roles idea, but wondered what would incentivize people to take them on. this is one question for all of you: what would make you want to take more responsibility to keep the space operating and expanding?

One exciting initiative discussed last night was an opportunity to open a new space in Ridgewood that could host Woodbine events, leaving 585 free for the working groups to manage collectively—if that's something people would want.

But for this to happen this organizational question need to be worked out. The spokes council, who will have their first meeting june 14, provides an opportunity. But spokes does not yet frame itself as an organizational body for the space, and seeks to be orthogonal to coordination. So I propose that these two bodies need to work in tandem—with discussion here and now in coordinators chat about how reorganize management of the space in a more collective direction, and another meeting soon. please folks here let us know, we are deferring to your input
/end

Daniel's Summary

Some of us arrived at this meeting not fully understanding what we had walked into. I thought the session was mostly going to be about "spring cleaning." In actuality, we didn't even get around to cleaning up the basement or other parts of the space. Instead, the directors told us that Woodbine was heading towards an organization/managerial crisis. On the one hand, within the last week, an amazing opportunity seems to be falling into our laps: the directors were presented with a potential opportunity for Woodbine to expand to a second space in Ridgewood, and it might even be possible to have the deed transferred to Woodbine (if we get our legal infrastructure in order, ie. potentially creating a new nonprofit, or reaching some agreement with Jim from Autonomedia, or some other solution that would be viable in the long term). On the other hand, also within the last week, it's become increasingly evident that the directors are burning out/getting burnt in ways that could lead to more of them reducing their involvement or Woodbine. If we're struggling to maintain one space, how can we handle a second space? Moreover, if more directors leave, and nobody else steps up to handle the sort of responsibilities that the directors have historically done, then we risk overburdening a shrinking pool of people with more tasks. In the most extreme scenario, we'd end up with only one person left in the director role – and nobody is looking forward to that happening. The directors don't want to hold such centralized power. But Woodbine has a legacy that we can't suddenly abandon: we have a lease with 9 years left, and agreements with Autonomedia to maintain, and taxes to pay. Beyond that, electricity needs to be running properly in the space, and it needs to be clean, rat-free, not flooded, etc.. The directors are the people who have been the most reliably involved with Woodbine for the longest time, they are doing essential work that so far nobody else is competent/knowledgeable enough to do, and it has been difficult to collectivize or find new people with the right skills to share this kind of work: ie. handling finances, rentals, dealing with the landlord and Autonomedia, etc. What I liked hearing at this meeting was a very sincere and open request for help with these kinds of essential administrative tasks. And it's disappointing that such a small group of coordinators were in attendance to hear this. The fact that turnout for this "boring" meeting was so low seems to indicate that as a group, we might not be ready to take on these administrative roles in a more collective and transparent way. (On the other hand, this meeting wasn't exactly billed as a time to work through problems in Woodbine's administrative structure -- and this miscommunication/misunderstanding might be reflective of some deeper problems, too).

We began discussing different proposals for reorganizing Woodbine's administrative/managerial structure that would help address these issues. One path was described in a document titled "[Woodbine Project Managers](#)" that Matt shared in the Coordinator's chat last week. To me, as one of the people who effectively ended up "project managing" the asbestos situation, it seems like a good proposal. The subtext that came out in our conversation is that the "Project Manager" role was initially modeled on the work that directors do: Directors are basically the people who have a lot of experience performing as Woodbine's project managers. The hope is that reframing the director role as a project manager could open the door to empowering more people to take on director-like responsibilities. It might not be a perfect proposal, but its a fine starting point and if someone has a better idea, they can make a revised version of the proposal or come up with something new. To me, the current presentation of the project manager role seems good enough that anyone who is interested could start using it immediately.

There were some passing question about how Spokes Council relates to or addresses these issues. It seems like more info about that will be shared at the upcoming meeting on June 14, 2025. But the bigger question for this meeting was about managing conflict in interpersonal dynamics and taking account of the ways different groups and individuals feel alienated from Woodbine. Woodbine wouldn't exist if it were not for the work that everybody has put into it from the start and throughout its history. It has taken a lot of work to make Woodbine what it is today.

Revision #2

Created 27 May 2025 20:41:42 by d s

Updated 27 May 2025 21:23:49 by d s