

Topic	Comments	Committee Response
Pres term	Very common sensical to have 2-year terms instead of constant hunt for next leader.	None
All	I am eager to review the draft.	<p>The proposed changes are available at the website, you are welcome to go back and review them and send any additional thoughts to the committee.</p> <p><a href="https://www.sra.org/about-sra/governance-review/">https://www.sra.org/about-sra/governance-review/</a></p>
Committee Composition and Misc Bylaws Cleanup	<p>In the proposal you say that, "We would "sunset" Regions, Specialty Groups, Executive, Publication and Conferences and Workshops as single standing committees and instead embed those functions elsewhere." I would be opposed to "sunset" the Specialty Groups to create a single standing committee. That makes no sense to me. It also seems counter to some of the text edits in the other documents which seems to imply continuation of the Specialty Groups, for which each one provides one member to serve on the advisory council. to be created. How does that work if you have "sunset" the Specialty Groups?</p>	<p>To clarify, we are not sunsetting Specialty Groups, they will continue to exist as is. However, there was a "Specialty Groups Committee" that consisted of the Committee Chairs. The tendency of this group to meet regularly was very inconsistent over time, and we felt that with the new Advisory Council structure that includes SG Chairs, there was no longer a need for them to meet separately as a committee. However, given this concern has been shared by a few Specialty Group chairs, we decided to just leave the committee as is in the proposed changes.</p>
Committee Composition and Misc Bylaws Cleanup	<p>Section V.E. As is currently, matters determined by ballot should require a majority of members voting for adoption.</p>	<p>This comment caused the committee to go back and carefully review all of the voting language in the bylaws to ensure that the language is consistently reflecting standard interpretations of Robert's Rules of Order pertaining to quorum and majority. We are proposing a standardization of the language throughout the bylaws (this is new as a result of the comment and these detailed proposed changes can be viewed in the voting documentation online). The proposed language is now the following: that a quorum for purposes of in-person and online member voting is 20% of the membership (or ~200 out of 1000 members voting), and a majority is necessary for adoption of any matter (or 2/3 as the case is explicitly for amendments to the Articles).</p>

All

Proposed Change 1: Presidential term language is not clear. It seems to be a 4-year period in total commitment. (1 year as Pre-elect President, 2-years as President, and 1 year as immediate past president).

Proposed Change 2: Board/Council. It would be good to name the Board Members who are elected officers (e.g., President, Pre-elect President or whomever) and the number of additional seats. Having a range may be better stated as up to 9 members with a minimum of 7 members required to vote on issues or something like that. Very vague as written.

Proposed Change 3: Committees - member engagement, regions, and specialty groups seems like a lot but I don't know what the workload is. Perhaps you could add one more for regions/specialty groups and let member engagement stand on its own.

Committee  
Composition  
and Misc  
Bylaws  
Cleanup

I am still a little confused about the fate of what we now call Specialty Groups. I have been happy with SG Chairs access to the mouth and ears of the Executive Council (henceforth Board) over the past year through the efforts of Peg and Jade. Still, I trust that some such avenue of communication will be retained.

Proposed Change 1: Yes, it is a four-year commitment as the comment states (1 year as elect, 2 as President, 1 as past-President). The committee will double check that the language is clear about these roles and any future commitments once the four-year term ends (e.g., in their fourth year while still serving on the Board, the immediate past President will chair the Awards Committee).

Proposed Change 2: The committee will double check that the language is clear as to the elected officers vs. additional at-large Board seats. The committee discussed additional at-large Board seats to address the concerns about the power being limited to too few in the Society. We expanded the proposed 3 at-large members to 5 at-large members to address this concern.

Proposed Change 3: The logic behind this change is that the Regions and Specialty Groups will be represented on the Advisory Council, so while the member engagement committee may do some interfacing with these aspects of our membership, they will not be solely responsible for managing relationships with specialty groups and regions, as the representatives of these groups will be on the Advisory Council, directly interfacing with the Board. We are also maintaining a separate Specialty Group committee due to concerns from some SG Chairs about losing the option to just meet with other Chairs.

The proposed new Advisory Council structure includes SG Chairs, so they would still have quarterly direct access to the EC/Board under the proposed structure. However, given the feedback to date, we decided to keep a formal Specialty Group Committee as it seems the Chairs want that structure to encourage formal interactions between themselves (and not necessarily just through the Advisory Council).

All

**PRESIDENTIAL TERM:** I am not in favor of the proposed change to the President's term. Any future candidate for SRA President will need to commit to a four-year "term." This may be longer than some, otherwise qualified, candidates may be willing to do, thus winnowing the available "top talent" for the position. While I agree it may take a year to "learn" the job, have the Immediate Past President officially on the Council provides the necessary continuity from one President to the next. Further, former Presidents often and generously made themselves available for tasks, consultations, mentoring, etc. after they have served as the Immediate Past President. In addition, I am not in favor of replacing the Chairperson of the Annual Program Committee (APC) with an appointed individual versus the President-elect. (The proposed two-year Presidential paradigm would only have a President-elect every other year.) As a long-standing member of the APC, I always found that the responsibility for the Annual Program was an excellent way of getting the President-elect involved with the Society across the entire spectrum of its multidisciplinary membership. The Chairperson has the ability to draw from their personal experiences and contact to shape the Annual Program (e.g., selection plenary speakers), while still being required to consider the needs of the entire membership. This, then, sets the stage for their subsequent year as President. There is the argument of lacking of continuity from one year to the next, but during my time on the APC, individuals, such as myself, provided legacy knowledge from one year to the next, providing the President-elect with the needed process elements, as well as providing them with the flexibility to "try new things."

**BOARD AND COUNCIL COMPOSITION:** The restructuring of the Society for Risk Analysis (SRA) governance into a smaller Board and a larger Council mimics the recent changes in the governance of ABET (creating a small Board of Directors and a larger Board of Delegates). This places the fiduciary and policy responsibilities for ABET to the smaller Board of Directors, while the Board of Delegates was responsible for the "nuts-and-bolts" of accreditation issues. In the SRA reorganization, all the "power" rests with the Board, with the Council making non-binding recommendations. This may or may not be the best way to reorganize ... nonetheless, if the changes related to the Board and

**PRES TERM:** While the formal role in the elected position will increase from 3 to 4 years, we are simultaneously planning to reduce the informal roles that the past-past (current year 4) and past-past-past Presidents (current year 5) play so that the overall commitment to the elected role and any additional expectations remains at no more than 5 years. Currently in the proposed changes, after stepping down from the formal 4-year role, there is no immediate expectation for future service unless it is as the Chair of the Governance/Nominations Committee, which will be chaired by a Past President (but doesn't have to be an immediate Past President). The current arrangement for the Program Committee is that it is co-chaired by the appointed Program Committee Chair (for continuity and to ensure that we are not annually experimenting) and the President-elect. The President-elect is currently responsible for the theme and plenaries and has considerable say in the format and structure of the meeting. The other co-chair handled more of the logistical planning to relieve the President-elect of this burden. All that being said, the committee revisited this question: namely who should formally co-chair the Annual Meeting committee if we move to only have a President-elect every other year. We decided it made the most sense for the President to co-chair the Annual Meeting during their two-year term. We also revisited the role of past Presidents in chairing awards and/or nominations (which is now embedded in governance). We decided the following. The President will co-chair the annual meeting during their two-year term as President. If we retain the one-year term then it is still the President elect who co-chairs for 1 year. The immediate past President will chair the Awards Committee for 1-year during their 4<sup>th</sup> year on Council/the Board. The Awards Committee will be composed of former Presidents and other former elected leaders appointed by Council in coordination with the Chair. If we retain the one-

Council passes, there should be a stipulation for a comprehensive review of the new governance paradigm and create an expectation (process) for making “tweaks” to overcome any identified issues/problems/bottlenecks with the new organization. It was also noted in the revised Bylaws that there is no stated organization structure for the newly formed Advisory Council. While it is stated that note shall be taken by the elected Society Secretary, there are no provisions for who would run the Council meetings, how that individual would be determined, who would run the meeting if the designated “leader” was not available, etc. The Bylaws should reflect and be specific about these and other related operational factors.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND MISC. BYLAWS CLEANUP: No additional comments.

GENERAL NON-EDITORIAL COMMENT: The changes presented are complicated, complex, and have significant impact on the governance/operation of the Society. While there have been webinars and sessions at the Annual Meeting to discuss these changes, I would recommend that after the comments have been received, evaluated, and integrated into the Bylaws and Society Articles, that there is additional opportunity for discussion among the membership that promotes conversations/discussions, e.g., webinar, in-person business meeting at the Annual Meeting.

year term than it is still the fifth-year job of current Presidents when they are past-past Pres). A former President will Chair the Governance/Nominations Committee for a 3-year term. This committee will be composed of former elected leaders (Presidents, Officers, Councilors/Board members) appointed by Council in coordination with the Chair. We are proposing this structure regardless of the outcome of the Presidential term vote.

BOARD AND COUNCIL: The committee will make sure we are being very clear about the structure for the Advisory Council, as well as the regular governance reviews that will occur under the new committee structure. We appreciate that comment and with the establishment of the Governance Committee as a formal standing committee, that group will move into regular reviews and management of Society governance to ensure we are being adaptive.

All

Change 1. The proposed change to a two-year term would reduce by half any member's opportunity to serve as SRA President. The current bylaws and articles define roles for P-elect, Pres, past-P, past past P, and past past past-P. The one-year term as SRA President is thus ample.

Change 2. The proposed change to reduce the top voting SRA officials from 14-15 (current) to 7-9 (proposed) would diminish the pipeline to experienced leadership. In the current system, the four or five SRA officers can convene with the Secretariat on any pace as needed for efficiency, with other SRA Councilors joining as their schedules allow. There is thus no urgency for this change, and there is actually harm to self-governance.

Change 3. The proposed committee structure seems fine. Its emphasis should be recruiting new and experienced SRA members to science collaborations, service of the science community and professional development.

Much appreciation for the learning and to all involved!

Hopefully this governance review and deliberation of SRA bylaws/articles will soon conclude, so that there is renewed focus of SRA leadership on science and science policy, knowledge dissemination through SRA publications and communications, member recruiting and development, participation in the SRA annual meeting and SRA regional/worldwide meetings, including the next SRA World Congress.

Thanks for this forum to comment on the proposed changes.

Change 1. While the formal role in the elected position will increase from 3 to 4 years, we are simultaneously planning to reduce the informal roles that current past Presidents play after their 3 formal years in office, such that the overall commitment to the elected role and any additional expectations remains at no more than 4 consecutive years (only more if a particular past President is identified to Chair the Governance Committee). Please see the detailed response above regarding the Presidential term.

Change 2. Currently, other SRA Councilors have very limited engagement with the Secretariat and the Executive Committee outside of the quarterly meetings. Formalizing the attendance of the Councilors (potential Board members) in those regular meetings with the Officers and Secretariat is part of the goal of the proposed change so that the elected Councilors/Board members are more involved in the day-to-day decision making. In practice, the Society is largely run by the Officers, and not the Council, which is part of the concern driving the proposed change (the need for more inclusive and engaged decision making).

Change 3. The committee hopes that some of these structural changes, in particular with the committees, will allow us to more efficiently and strategically pursue our goals around service of the science community and professional development. The committee is equally excited to turn our attention to these other priorities.

All	Extending the presidential term will make it more difficult to recruit candidates. I have worked with other societies that tried to do so and it didn't work. As it is, a 3-year commitment for a busy professional is substantial. I am fine with the other two changes above that are recommended.	None
All	Agree to all three changes.	None
Pres term	I think the society is large enough that there are plenty of presidential candidates and changing the term for 1 year to 2 years will half the number of people who can provide leadership.	The actual slate of Presidential candidates year to year is actually fairly small, and while we hope to address the nominations process to broaden that pool, the majority of the committee is not concerned about reduced opportunities for leadership. However, the proposed Presidential term change is a proposed change that the committee does not unanimously support, and we welcome members to vote and express their opinion on this and all other proposed changes.
All	Hard to know if I would like to comment without seeing the suggested changes.	The proposed changes are available at the website, you are welcome to go back and review them and send any additional thoughts to the committee.  <a href="https://www.sra.org/about-sra/governance-review/">https://www.sra.org/about-sra/governance-review/</a>
Committee Composition and Misc Bylaws Cleanup	Reducing committees serves to reduce opportunities for members to participate  We should be encouraging participation from all levels of membership. Most of these changes reduce opportunities for all but an elite few.	While the committee recognizes this concern, the reality is that it is difficult to get members to volunteer for leadership positions (elected or otherwise). We do not believe these changes will reduce the opportunity, but we do believe that the nominations and recruitment process must be addressed to ensure that the opportunities are open to all. We will be addressing the nominations process in our continuing work to ensure equitable participation from all in those opportunities.

Presidential term (Bylaws, Articles), Board and Council Composition (Bylaws, Articles)

Box 1:

1. Increasing the SRA President's tenure (i) increases the risk of stagnant leadership, (ii) adds complexity to SRA management (elections will differ each year), and (iii) limits opportunities for new leadership.
2. The additional change of removing the President-Elect's role as the Chair of the Program Committee is unjustified and undesirable. This proposed change was not recommended in the 2022 Governance Report, not considered by the Governance Committee, and was not discussed in the listening session with the Members. It is a bad idea since it reduces the innovation of ideas discussed and is inappropriate to make this change without consulting the members and discussing it in the appropriate committee.

Box 2:

1. The reduction in the number of elected and voting SRA officials from 14-15 (currently) to 7-9 (proposed) makes the SRA less democratic, prone to mismanagement, and decreases the possibility for new leaders to emerge. This requires significant changes to the Articles of Incorporation, which is not desirable and would be a major departure from what the SRA Founders had in mind. Critically, the suggested changes to bylaws may foster challenges in achieving quorum at SRA meetings – with fewer board members, each member's presence becomes more critical for achieving quorum for decision-making. This could pose challenges if board members are unable to attend meetings due to unforeseen circumstances, delaying important decisions.

2. The creation of an Advisory Council may be a good idea, but a smaller advisory council and a larger body of elected SRA Council Members may be a better option. While the Advisory Council may have increased representation, it's unclear what actual power or influence this body will have compared to the executive board. This could result in a large group of members feeling they have a voice but little real impact on decisions. Fewer board members could mean a heavier workload for each, potentially leading to burnout or a decline in the quality of governance due to overburdened individuals. This is further exacerbated by the longer tenure of certain roles, such as President.

3. There is a real risk of groupthink and potential misrepresentation of societal wishes by reducing the voting board membership count. A smaller board might lead to groupthink, where a lack of diversity in opinions can stifle innovation and critical analysis of the Society's strategies and policies. Reducing the number of voting members concentrates decision-making power, potentially alienating the wider membership and reducing their influence on Society direction and policy. Likewise, the risk of favoritism, or at least the perception of favoritism, can produce harmful perceptions of SRA leadership attentiveness to issues outside of their host institutions or fields of expertise. A larger board, as currently construed, eases the equitable representation of SRA's diverse membership.

Re: the Annual Meeting Chair: The current arrangement for the Program Committee is that it is co-chaired by the appointed Program Committee Chair (for continuity and to ensure that we are not annually experimenting) and the President-elect who determines the theme and plans the plenaries. This was a change made by the Council, and this approach will continue into the future unless Council changes it. If the two-year Presidential term passes, then the President will co-chair the Annual Meeting during their two years as President.

Re: the number of Board positions: The committee discussed the ideal range of Board members, and even additional at-large Board seats to address the concerns about the power being limited to too few in the Society. While the majority of the Committee feels that having fewer individuals more actively involved in the regular management of the Society will lead to more inclusive vs. exclusive decision making – we did decide to expand the recommendation for at-large Board members from 3 to 5.

Re: the Advisory Council: The committee reviewed the structure and power of the Advisory Council in the proposed changes and did not recommend any additional changes/language. The Board having to go on-record to respond to AC concerns is one such example meant to ensure their advice is heeded.

Re: Diversity on the Board: As mentioned in previous comments, those willing to serve in these positions are limited, and the Committee will also be working to improve the nominations process to ensure that opportunities to serve are more inclusive and representative.

Re: Charge: The majority of the committee, and those who participated in the original governance review, would argue that SRA is not operating as successfully as it could, and that these proposed changes are part of an effort to modernize the

1. Charge: The SRA has successfully operated for over 40 years without any changes to its articles of incorporation and only minor changes to its by-laws. Like changes to a national Constitution, any amendments to the by-law should be carefully vetted and discussed extensively. The proposed changes will not have the intended impact and are not desired at this time.

2. Process: The process for collecting data and recommendations for by-law changes is questionable for several reasons: (i) both the consulting company that conducted the initial study and several members of the SRA Governance Committee were compensated for this work, which may create a vested interest in seeing the changes implemented; (ii) the limited number of interviewees (less than 30), as well as the nonrandomized sampling of interviewees, significantly restricted the diversity of opinions, and the inclusion of paid consultants among the interviewees undermines the credibility of the study; (iii) the committee's work was conducted virtually, without a single face-to-face meeting, and only included two in-person sessions with the membership, which were not attended by the full Governance Committee or SRA leadership; (iv) the membership was given only two weeks to review the changes in writing, whereas previously, only presentations were provided without discussing all the changes; (v) the form for submitting comments is poorly designed, confusing, and requires a Google account, which not all members have. Moreover, the voting structure is not straightforward and is questionable.

3. Impact: Essentially, the proposed changes (i) consolidate the power of the president and the executive body, (ii) limit the opportunity for members to participate in Society leadership, and (iii) reduce diversity in the elected Society leadership, thus making the Board less representative of the SRA membership and potentially making the SRA less attractive to new members.

Society for great impact and efficiency. However, we encourage all members to vote and express their opinions on these changes.

Re: Process: We have been discussing these proposed changes and bringing them to the Council, other leaders in the Society (e.g., SG Chairs) and broader membership for feedback and discussion for almost 2 years. As a result, we feel that an appropriate process for vetting and discussion has been followed. While Brighter Strategies was hired to conduct the Governance Review and served as a sounding board for the Committee during our first year of discussions, they have never exhibited a preference for the outcome of our discussions. The only member of the committee that was "compensated" for their work was the Chair, who was offered a small honorarium for taking on the heavy lift of facilitating this process and doing all the behind the scenes work for the Committee.