

This is an archival forum from the **FamilySearch Wiki Contributors' Corner forum**.

View Poll Results: Time lapse between 3rd failed communication with moderator/adopter & consequence?

2 weeks	4	26.67%
3 weeks	1	6.67%
4 weeks	6	40.00%
5 weeks	0	0%
6 weeks	4	26.67%

Multiple Choice Poll. Voters: 15. You may not vote on this poll

26.02.2011, 13:45

RitcheyMT

⌚ "Three strikes" communication policy for moderators and adopters

Some contributors have expressed frustration that when they try to communicate with a moderator or adopter in order to coordinate content writing within their assigned area, they don't get a response. I'm proposing a three strikes rule. A moderator or adopter who has received three attempts at communication from another user through their User Talk (discussion) page or Email This User link has a limited time to respond after the third attempt. If they don't reply within this time period, action will be taken by the community (probably probation or removal as moderator/adopter). What should the time period be between the third communication attempt and the community action?

27.02.2011, 11:08

evancol

Michael ... I'm wondering if we wouldn't want at least that final attempt to be made from someone appointed to follow up on MIA adopters/moderators.

Jane

27.02.2011, 15:57

RitcheyMT

We're thinking in parallel....

Quote:

Originally Posted by **evancol**

Michael ... I'm wondering if we wouldn't want at least that final attempt to be made from someone appointed to follow up on MIA adopters/moderators.

I agree that it would be a good idea for someone official to contact the moderator or adopter before they're removed, Jane. I think maybe it might be good to make that attempt outside of these three from the other contributor. I'm not suggesting what the consequence for three strikes is; I just want to get a feel for what the community feels is acceptable and

non-acceptable regarding communication from moderators and adopters.

28.02.2011, 11:40

evancol

I think the consequence should be dismissing them. If they fail to answer 3 user e-mails and then one from FS/their representative, unless they had some major life crisis, I think it is a pretty clear sign they are not very dedicated to the Wiki.

I think it is much better for the Wiki to have a page without a moderator/adopter to answer questions than to have one listed who just doesn't respond. I think ultimately that reflects badly on everyone involved.

Jane

01.03.2011, 10:02

jbarker

"Three strikes"

Will there be an acceptable time period between the three attempts by a contributor to contact the moderator. I can see an impatient contributor making three attempts in a single day. On the other hand, if the three attempts are spread over, say, a month, then the moderator definitely should be contacted.

I voted for 4 weeks to allow for vacations, health issues, family matters requiring attention, etc.

Last edited by jbarker; 01.03.2011 at 10:05.

02.03.2011, 20:35

jamestanner

A matter of interest and involvement

It is one of the facts of life that people have things happen that change their priorities either temporarily or permanently. It is also very easy to get over extended and have to cut back on activities. I assume that anyone volunteering as a moderator or adopter was at the point where they thought their time would allow the involvement. It may also happen that the individual underestimated the complexity of the job.

My suggestion is that all moderators and all adopters have to re-up or sign up again every six months or so. If everyone was on a cycle where every June 30 and every December 30 you had to express a positive interest in maintaining your status, the problem, if there is one, would likely take care of itself. You could have something really simple to keep going, like making an edit or updating your personal page.

One problem I see with having a three strike policy on contact is problems with e-mail. One of my accounts is currently sending everything to junk mail, even after I have marked it not junk. In another case, a G-mail account was suddenly closed by Google for no reason at all

and I could not get the address back. In those cases, I may not realize that the address I had listed in the Wiki was the bad address.

Just some more thoughts.

*James Tanner
<http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com>]*

02.03.2011, 20:57

JamesAnderson

I just posted a reply that applies to this thread as well on the other inactive moderators poll. Has to do with the fact that sometimes a medical issue may in fact prevent them, due to the suddenness of the medical incident, from letting us know they will be offline for an extended period.

On the closed Gmail account, I heard it was a snarl with one or more of their servers, over 200,000 users were affected according to one report, but Google said they are working to restore as many of those accounts as possible as soon as they can.

06.03.2011, 20:11

RitcheyMT

Mitigating the bad email account problem

I agree that sometimes faulty email account settings can trash good incoming email, and that sometimes even the email account provider (like Google) can wipe out accounts. I think that to mitigate these issues, the communication sent from FamilySearch or the community that is outside of these three messages from the other user should be posted to the non-responder's user talk page. That way, they'll get an email plus an internal message that shows up on the top of their screen when they log in to the wiki.

07.03.2011, 08:10

jamestanner

Good idea, and if understood would increase the importance of the User Page as well as the Talk Page.

*James Tanner
<http://genealogysstar.blogspot.com>]*

27.04.2011, 09:50

evancol

Has this policy been put in place?

Jane

