

12/08/2024: Spokescouncil Signal Group Policy

Spokescouncil Signal Group Policy

Person or group submitting

Frankie

Proposal History

- Submission Date: 12/8/24
- Vote date: ---
- Vote result: Pass

Motivation

Once the Spokescouncil meets for the 1st time, things will probably come up that need to be circulated among Spokes. For example, circulating a link to some resource that a Spoke agrees to provide during the meeting. We should have a plan for setting up this type of Signal chat.

Proposal overview ~~slightly less tiny~~ ~~summary here~~

I propose that the Woodbine Spokescouncil itself should decide on an initial Signal group structure. The Spokescouncil Working Group can use existing Signal chats to contact Working Groups and initiate the first Spokescouncil meeting. During the meeting, the Spokescouncil can identify a way of maintaining async communication, if one is necessary. I don't think deciding this in advance is a precondition for a successful 1st Spokescouncil meeting.

Details

Background info

Woodbine primarily uses Signal to async organize today. It seems like folks are largely comfortable using the platform.

Groups this affects

All

Work required

1. None right now 2. Submit a proposal to the 1st Spokes council meeting about forming a Signal chat version of the Spokes council 3. Create a Signal chat that includes the Spokesperson(s) from each Spoke who attend

Individual or group doing labor

- Frankie -> writing + submitting the proposal to the Spokes)
- Frankie (or anyone else) -> creating the actual chat

Money required

None

Proposals

Defer decision on chat policy for the Spokes

- We need not decide on chat policy for the Spokes council right now (as a Spokes council)
- We can bring a proposal for a chat to the 1st Spokes council meeting, let Spokes decide on it

comments (format: commenter name: comment)

- Ash: this makes sense to me. as a council, i agree, we don't have to have it all worked out in advance (and shouldn't) but I think it's good to have some basic structures and pitfalls in mind to work into the discussion and prompt people to think through. i suggest we don't make the signal group at all until a signal chat protocol proposal is made and agreed upon as a group because chats get messy fast and they can be a huge detriment to moral and process if culture and protocols aren't agreed upon early (i sadly know this from

experiencing almost total burn out of a group and broken friendships while organizing for a large event, even despite agreeing on these protocols early on). some examples are:

1. what is the signal chat for?
 2. what kinds of discussions and decisions can be made there v irl?
 3. admin protocols/privelages
 4. who is in the chat? how are people added? (ex. does a newbie who joins the tues reading group for one session, get added to the chat?)
 5. digital conflict culture (aka "take it offline") and a plurality of screen boundaries
 6. posting irrelevant content like upcoming events at wb (some ppl can find this distracting if a chat is very heavily decision/action based v socializing)
 7. expectations around the allowed time for people to respond to an in-chat proposal before moving on (ex. 2 days to 1 week depending on the urgency).
- paul: I sometimes imagine this as a system where it's a signal group where only admins can post. anyone from the working groups can join and lurk but the only admins are the people who are the currently-acting spokes for their groups. I feel like this would help limit the traffic in the spokes chat as any working-group-talking-amongst-itself chatter would have to happen elsewhere. but this also feels maybe a big complicated to implement and might be too much to ask of a spokesperson.
 - paul: ok actually here's maybe an example of what we could propose to the spokesconcil itself:

“ == Proposal for the "Spokesconcil Fishbowl Chat" == This chat exists in order to facilitate inter-WG communication between all the various working groups at WB, while keeping intra-WG conversation to other channels. Anyone is free to join and view, but only the designated spokesperson(s?) for each working group is able to post.

Things that make sense to post in this chat:

1. Working out when the next meeting should be
2. Announcing that you are proposing something for discussion at the next council meeting, ideally with a link to the proposal write up
3. Announcements that potentially affect all WGs: "there will be no power in the building until tomorrow afternoon", "the door code is about to change".
4. A question that a working group has where it's unclear who to direct the question to.
5. ... ?