

At Large Constituency Options
ORGANIZATIONAL OPTIONS FOR COMMITTEES

I. “Balanced Representation” –

A. Composition –

- 1) **Model A (smaller) – 17** member committee with **15** voting members.
 - 1 Committee Chair (from any sector) selected by the Conference Chair and approved by the Executive Board;
 - 6 Regulatory members (one from each CFP region);
 - 6 industry members (selected by the industry caucus);
 - 1 consumer group member;
 - 1 academic member;
 - 1 FDA advisor; and
 - 1 USDA advisor].
 - a) The advisory roles would not be voting members of the committee.

 - 2) **Model B (larger) – 29** member committee with **27** voting members.
 - 1 Committee Chair (from any sector) selected by the Conference Chair and approved by the Executive Board;
 - 12 Regulatory members (two from each CFP region);
 - 12 industry members (selected by the industry caucus);
 - 1 consumer group member;
 - 1 academic member;
 - 1 FDA advisor; and
 - 1 USDA advisor.
 - a) The advisory roles would not be voting members of the committee.
-
- 3) **Model C (smaller) – 16** member committee with **13** voting members
 - 1 Committee Chair (from any sector) selected by the Conference Chair and approved by the Executive Board. The Chair would NOT hold a vote on the committee.
 - 6 Regulatory members (one from each CFP region);
 - 6 industry members (selected by the industry caucus);
 - 1 consumer group member;
 - 1 academic member;
 - 1 FDA advisor; and
 - 2 USDA advisors.
 - a) The advisory roles would not be voting members of the committee.
-
- 4) **Model D (larger) -28** member committee with **25** voting members.
 - 1 Committee Chair (from any sector) selected by the Conference Chair and approved by the Executive Board. The Chair would NOT hold a vote on the committee

12 Regulatory members (two from each CFP region);
12 industry members (selected by the industry caucus);
1 consumer group member;
1 academic member;
1 FDA advisor; and
1 USDA advisor.

a) The advisory roles would not be voting members of the committee.

B. Composition Details –

- 1) The regulatory members would be selected by each CFP region.
- 2) The industry members would be selected by the private sector caucus.
- 3) The consumer member nomination would be recruited by the committee chair and approved by the committee membership.
- 4) The academic member nomination would be recruited by the committee chair and approved by the committee membership.
- 5) The FDA advisor (non-voting) and USDA advisor (non-voting) would be selected by their respective agencies. It was noted that advising agencies may not have staffing for all committees so advisory roles could be offered, but not mandatory, to agencies.
- 6) The advisors would not have voting privileges, but the other **15** or **27** members would have voting privileges.

C. Format –

- 1) This model would use two equally balanced (in number) groups. Each of the **15** or **27** members would represent the voice of their region/group and be responsible for representing that voice during committee activities.

D. Pros:

- 1) This model (can) makes committees smaller and easier to manage so things can move quicker and more issues can be worked (not as easily as the “Regional” model, but easier than the “Organizational” model).
- 2) The chair has an easier role under this type of model (not as easy as the “Regional” model, but easier than the “Organizational” model).

E. Cons:

- 1) This type of model puts more of the burden on the representative as opposed to the individual voice (not as much as with the “Regional” model, but more so than the “Organizational” model).
- 2) Anyone who has desired input would have to contact their representative and provide their input.

- 3) Opens the discussion to criticism if individuals don't feel they have had their voice heard or feel they didn't have the ability to provide input (not as much as with the "Regional" model, but more so than the "Organizational" model).
- 4) Representatives would be responsible for any necessary discussions leading up to the committee meetings in order to provide accurate representation (not as much as with the "Regional" model, but more so than the "Organizational" model).
- 5) Difficulty ensuring the representatives are accurately conveying the voices of whom they represent (not as much as with the "Regional" model, but more so than the "Organizational" model).

F. Discussion Points:

- 1) This model creates mid-sized committees and is somewhere in the middle between the "Regional" and "Organizational" models.
- 2) The Conference Chair would select a committee chair with approval from the BOD.
- 3) In order to maintain an odd number of members to avoid tie votes a committee chair in addition to the other members would be selected from any sector by the Conference Chair.
- 4) The committee chair would have the option to recognize others not on the committee for further clarification or explanation of input on issues.
- 5) This would apply to the eleven standing committees, but not necessarily to the ad-hoc committees.
- 6) This model does provide a relatively balanced vote within the committee considering the number from each sector represented.
- 7) Important for members of CFP to reach out to their representatives to provide input and opinions. It is then incumbent upon the representatives to relay that information to the committee. The identity of the representatives would be published on the CFP website to allow ease of identification and access to all CFP members.
- 8) Non-committee members may listen in on calls and meetings but would not have a voice during the calls or meetings unless called upon by the Chair.

II. "Organizational Representation"

A. Composition – Unlimited (at the discretion of the committee chair);

- 1 FDA advisor; and
- 1 USDA advisor.

B. Composition Details:

- 1) Allows for the committee to be as large as the chair would like.
- 2) Comprised of as many members from any sector as granted by the committee chair.
- 3) The FDA advisor (non-voting) and USDA advisor (non-voting) would be selected by their respective agencies. It was noted that advising agencies

may not have staffing for all committees so advisory roles could be offered, but not mandatory, to agencies.

- 4) The advisors would not have voting privileges, but the other members would have voting privileges (one per organizational membership).

C. Format –

- 1) Each organizational membership gets one vote (even if multiple members from a single organization are on the committee) and represents their own voice.

D. Pros:

- 1) Each member is solely responsible for representing their own voice.
- 2) Anyone (voting members, non-voting members, and non-members) can participate in meetings and speak.
- 3) Voting limited to those on the membership roster only.
- 4) Each organization that is member of the committee (on the roster) has one vote only.

E. Cons:

- 1) This model makes committees larger and more difficult to manage.
- 2) Potential for dialogue to extend beyond necessity.
- 3) Need an experienced and/or strong chair with good time management skills.
- 4) Committee output can be swayed by singular interests.
- 5) Requires member organizations to be grouped together to distribute if balanced voting is used.
- 6) Roster maintenance is necessary to ensure regular participation.
- 7) A balanced voting system/formula is usually also necessary.

F. Discussion Points:

- 1) The Conference Chair would select a committee chair with approval from the BOD.
- 2) The chair would likely need officers to assist with the oversight and maintenance of this type of committee (if large).
- 3) This would apply to the eleven standing committees, but not necessarily to the ad-hoc committees.
- 4) Committee sizes would be different from one committee to another.
- 5) Important for members of CFP to reach out to their representatives to provide input and opinions. It is then incumbent upon the representatives to relay that information to the committee. The identity of the representatives would be published on the CFP website to allow ease of identification and access to all CFP members.
- 6) Non-committee members may listen in on calls and meetings but would not have a voice during the calls or meetings unless called upon by the Chair.

III. “Regional Representation”

A. Composition –

- 11** member committee with **9** voting members
- 6** Regulatory members (one from each CFP region);
- 3** industry members (selected by the industry caucus);

- 1 FDA advisor; and
- 1 USDA advisor.

B. Composition Details:

- 1) The regulatory members would be selected by each CFP region.
- 2) The industry members would be selected by the private sector caucus.
- 3) The FDA advisor (non-voting) and USDA advisor (non-voting) would be selected by their respective agencies. It was noted that advising agencies may not have staffing for all committees so advisory roles could be offered, but not mandatory, to agencies.
- 4) The advisors would not have voting privileges, but the other 9 members would have voting privileges.

C. Format –

- 1) Each of the 9 voting positions would represent the voice of their region/group and be responsible for presenting that voice during committee activities.

D. Pros:

- 1) This model makes committees small and easier to manage so things can
- 2) : move quicker and more issues can be worked.
- 3) The chair has an easier role under this type of model.

E. Cons:

- 1) This type of model puts more of the burden on the representative rather than the individual voice.
- 2) Anyone who has desired input would have to contact their representative and provide their input.
- 3) Opens the discussion to criticism if individuals don't feel they have had their voice heard or feel they didn't have the ability to provide input.
- 4) Other meetings may be needed to acquire input prior to the committee meeting.
- 5) Representatives would be responsible for any necessary discussions leading up to the committee meetings in order to provide accurate representation.
- 6) Difficulty ensuring the representatives are accurately conveying the voices of whom they represent.

F. Discussion Points:

- 1) The Conference Chair would select a committee chair with approval from the BOD.
- 2) The committee chair would have the option to recognize others not on the committee for further clarification or explanation of input on issues.
- 3) This would apply to the eleven standing committees, but not necessarily to the ad-hoc committees.
- 4) Important for members of CFP to reach out to their representatives to provide input and opinions. It is then incumbent upon the representatives to relay that information to the committee. The identity of the representatives would be published on the CFP website to allow ease of identification and access to all CFP members.

- 5) Non-committee members may listen in on calls and meetings but would not have a voice during the calls or meetings unless called upon by the Chair.