

Governance Review 2011

Fellowship Consultation as at 29 June 2011

Arguments For:

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
1		This change is long overdue. It will hopefully mean that when some of us make contact with the RSA regarding ideas, they are less likely to just disappear.							
2		I have read the documents you sent and happy with them. I congratulate those who have done all the difficult but necessary work of producing them.							
3		Many thanks for the work you've all done on this review and for seeking comments.	Recommended that all Trustees be Fellows						
4			Two treasurers seems excessive					Development plans- good for accountability	
5		Having reviewed the consultation paper I can state I am fully supportive of all recommendations							
6		Thanks for launching a good process with good results. The proposal is very sounds with a good blend of the best of several alternative pure models							There is a need now to have a period of real communication and engagement about the nature of the RSA today and its role in the world
7							The Fellow should be entitled to attend the hearing accompanied by a supporter and that the supporter shall have the right to speak on behalf of the Fellow.	Regional Chairs should hold office on a 3+3 year basis	
8		The proposed changes seem reasonable and have my support.	The Board needs a balance of age, gender and expertise with particular emphasis on financial oversight and fund raising.						
9		The GAG has clearly worked hard to produce a sensible and balanced set of proposals. I have some idea of the scale and complexity of your work having managed similar processes as Chair of Save the Children UK and of the International Save the Child Alliance.	There is no mention to board development or board assessment. These are important aspects of good governance. Why two Treasurers?						

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
10		Having spent hours/days/months on governance committees I appreciate the efforts of GAG. What is proposed seems fine to me and it is certainly better than what we have now.							
11		GAG has done the Society a great service in preparing this thoroughly professional report and in making these recommendations.							
12		I think the recommendations look like a sensible way to take the Society forward.							
13		Many thanks to you and the other members of the Governance Advisory Group for your work. The recommendations seem very sensible to me and I would strongly support accepting them as a package.							
14		In my opinion all of the GAG recommendations seem quite sensible and productive.							
15		It all seems eminently sensible			It may be a bit unwieldy obtaining the numbers for thresholds for SGM resolution and trustee removal but I entirely agree with aligning those thresholds with benchmark practices.				The resources of the RSA should be sufficient to ensure that the appropriate number of fellows can be contacted.
16		I am happy to support the proposals but I have one very strong objection			Fellows do not have access to anything like 500 Fellows.				It is unlikely that the Society would be willing to provide access to its mailing list (even in a manner which meets Data Protection requirements)
17		Makes sense to me			The calling of "Unnecessary" meetings is a rare occasion, I would prefer the bigger numbers proposed be reduced.				
18			Wholly or mainly elected but with an option to co-opt to fill (a few) skills gaps: two co-optees						It could have been made easier for Fellows to comment on the document, for example by posing a list of key questions in a survey style.

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
19		Fully support and thank you for taking the time and trouble, with your colleagues, over this.							
20			There should be a harmonization between Board and FC for non-attendance.	Non-attendance for 3 consecutive meetings					Would electronic means of engaging and contributing to meeting be counted as attendance
21		Having read the relevant documents I have no serious problems with the proposed revisions				"is absent without good cause from two consecutive meetings." How would the notion of "good cause" be interpreted in practice?	Some Fellows have been elected for Life. In the case of Life Fellow expelled from the RSA, what approach would the organisation take if the amount already paid as a lifetime subscription had not yet equalled what the expelled Fellow would have paid in annual subscription over her/his years of Fellowship?		
22		I think these proposals strike a good balance & I am happy to support them.							
23		I support the recommendations made in the governance review.							
24		I commend the work of those involved in the GAG. It is clearly a difficult road to find the balance between an effective governance structure and the democratic instincts of the Fellowship.							
25		I have read the report and agree with the thrust of it.	My only point is that I would prefer to see a <b>majority</b> of Elected members i.e. 7 to 5.						
26		I am content with all this, and will be glad to see the end of the unfortunately named GAG. I would like to comment that I am particularly glad to see that the main business of the RSA is to serve the public. Not that serving Fellows is unimportant, far from it, and not that listening to Fellows is unimportant, far from it. Yet the core business, our strategic focus, is and should be the whole of society.							

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
27		I have read the GAG proposals as well as their well-researched deliberations. I consider that their proposals are, adequate, timely and fit for purpose.							
28		Balancing bringing in new blood versus failure of continuity and free election of the popular but inexperienced versus experienced but with danger of oligarchy is never easy. It seems to me that a lot of thought has gone into it to get those balances and the process is transparent.							
29		Welcome the recommendations	It is essential that there should be more 'elected' Board members. I would strongly advise seven elected and five co-opted.						The aim should surely be <i>'to ensure that the Board fully reflects the views of the Fellowship'</i> .
30		Thank you and the GAG for your time and energy working to write such a thorough yet understandable document.  I read the report carefully and fully support your recommendations. I think the new structure, if adopted, would equip the society well for whatever challenges lie ahead.	In particular, you have struck the right balance between representing fellows and ensuring a board which is well balanced in terms of the skills needed to do its business.						
31		The proposed amendments appear to be sound, particularly those that reform the way in which Fellows can be invited to serve on the Board, the audit of skills which should produce a more balanced Board, and the requirement for regular attendance, which should result in improved continuity and commitment.	The previous requirements for nomination and secondment precluded me from applying for a Board position.						
32		The group has clearly conducted a very thorough examination on the way in which governance should move in the RSA - well done. And it seems to me that your recommendations are in line with what this organisation should be aiming to achieve. I fully support them.							
33		I agree with all that you and your colleagues say.	Is attendance defined to include attendance electronically i.e. either by telephone or video link?			"good cause" needs to be defined within the limits of "reasonableness".	I think there is a problem that the proposal is over-prescriptive on this issue.		

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
34		Many thanks for sharing the Governance Review with Fellows, and for doing such a good job on it. I have only one significant comment. Otherwise – great!	For clarity and democracy I would always have the elected Trustees outnumbering the co-opted						
35		The consultation document seems very sensible							
36		The report needs more clarity and has to be explained in line with the changes in the Bye Laws.	I think you need to say that your 12 person Board will include the 'officers'. Why do we need two Treasurers anyway?	This seems very large indeed.  Maybe this is the nature of the 'Beast' as it were when trying to identify suitable future Fellows.	I do not agree that so many Fellows must come together to have the right to propose a motion at the AGM. Please return to 25.		There should be someone in the Panel who was party to the original decision and maybe one other member of the FC and one independent Fellow who has not heard the original case and can provide a fresh and unbiased view of the facts.		
37		The conclusions appear well considered and balanced.							
38		Quite happy with the content. I am happy that you have bench marked RSA against organisations of a similar constitution - this is good work. I have no specific comments and am happy with the outcomes.							
39		Read your Document with great relief. My opinion is that your proposals do a lot to ease the situation and I welcome them in their entirety.							
40		I think the new structure will not be as England oriented as it has been in the past. All too often the attitude has been that we in London know best and this has resulted in a general indifference in fellows living out of Britain.							
41		I am happy with these recommendations.							
42		In general, I am in agreement with the recommendations from the Governance Review.					I am concerned about the removal of the appeals process from the clauses about expulsion.		

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
43		On the whole I feel that the tone of the review is positive and helpful and I warmly welcome it. The report makes no suggestions as to how the transition from present arrangements.	The majority of Trustees on the Trustee Board should be elected.					The majority of members of the Regional Teams be elected by the Fellows in the Region.	Regions are increasingly disregarded and sidelined.
44		I am writing with more comments on the RSA governance consultation, having been pleased that my own and I imagine several others' representations on first draft regional organization plans appear to have been taken to heart.	A majority of elected trustees - 7, and a minority of co-opted trustees, 5.		Such a threshold would in practice make it impossible for any Fellow to table an AGM resolution, however given there are no means of Fellows communicating with each other than via the central, controlled communications system.				
45		The Governance Advisory Group and all those associated with the research and hard work that has obviously gone into this exercise, are to be congratulated on producing a way forward for the Society to fully contribute to the world.							
46			I suggest a majority of elected members: 7:5		I agree that a greater number of Fellows should be required before calling an SGM, but I disagree strongly to the idea that 250 names should be required to put a resolution before the AGM.		I disagree very strongly with the suggestion that there should be no appeal from the decision of the original 3 board members. 'Modernising' here appears to mean 'saving the time of Board members'.	The idea of a 'panel of co-opted Fellows does not sound like a good way of involving more Fellows on the ground.	
47		Many thanks for providing members an opportunity to comment	I would like in principle for there to be a simple majority of elected Fellows on the board i.e. 7 elected with 5 co-optees.						Suggests that the bye-law detailing the business of the AGM should include in line with best practice, the receipt in parallel with the Annual Accounts, of an annual environmental report detailing the environmental performance of the RSA over the previous financial year.

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
48		The great majority of the proposals seem positive and to be cast in such a way as to enhance the work of the RSA and increase its effectiveness.			I strongly disagree with increasing the thresholds for calling an SGM and for removing a trustee.				The critical issue is not the percentage of the membership, but the judgement as to whether groups of 50 and 25 fellows are regarded as sufficient to warrant their voices being heard.
49		I am pleased to see that there is a much more enabling and flexible strategy in the GAG recommendations.  Rather than having a framework imposed upon Nations / regions re their plans it would be more enlightening to have a set of guidelines for support for Nations and regions.							
50			There should be a good number of members co-opted. I always find it difficult to use all my votes as I can't find enough candidates that meet my expectations. To stand as a candidate does not mean you are qualified to do the job.		I fully support the need for 250 Fellows to support a motion. That will mean that valuable time, meant to be spent on innovative issues, is not wasted on issues of little interest to most Fellows.			I fully support the close monitoring of regional aspects by the RSA.	
51								This will improve on the current situation in Scotland. This process will be a much more democratic and transparent practice and allow much better selection of candidates for the post of Regional Chair.	
52		I would like to indicate my support for a team based structure with a strand that creates focus in each of the devolved areas and the regions. There should be an open and transparent election process for all office holders.							

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
53		I generally support the thrust of the recommendations.	There should be a requirement for candidates for election to the Board to demonstrate in their address how they meet the requirements described by the Nominations Panel.					<p>The Board should set out the values and minimum standards, terms of reference for regions.</p> <p>There should be interim arrangements to fill the position if the Chair leaves before the end of the 2-year term.</p>	
54		<p>You've done quite a good job of benchmarking. The proposals are OK.</p> <p>I personally still think you've done a reasonable job at arriving at a new governance code (i.e. it followed a process, and it was transparent)</p> <p>The disgruntled group didn't articulate themselves very well, which is a shame as they are clearly upset.</p>							
55		I support the recommendations, finding them to be wholly positive, appropriate and sensible.							
56		Thank you for the balance							
57		<p>I would like to point to overarching matters that should guide the next stage of the debate – and guide people when they consider how to comment and vote on the GAG proposals, if I may.</p> <p>Whilst the legal form of the RSA (a Royal Charter body) of necessity involves a "membership" it is not a membership body in the way that non-charitable members' organisations are (tennis clubs, trades unions, professional bodies etc).</p>							The RSA does not exist for the benefit of its members or to champion them (individually or collectively). Like every charity, it exists for the benefit of wider society and for its specific beneficiary group (which is also society as a whole).

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
58		Thanks for the clarity and the positives							
59		You have my full support.							
60		I must thank all of those involved in the production of this thorough document. Clearly a lot of research and discussion has gone into this by the Governance Advisory Group and it has been very interesting to read the comparisons of other 'similar' bodies.  I am fully supportive of the RSA and would like to support the recommendations.							
61		I am confident that you and your colleagues will eventually improve the organisational framework and you certainly have my full support in your efforts to do so.							
62		All the proposals seem to be reasonable to me and thus I support the changes.							
63		The GAG has done some fine work including the analysis of aspects of so many not-for-profit organisations.							However, have concern when I read that the Fellowship Council 'will help Fellows to work with the RSA'. Maybe this is just lazy wording but what is this separate entity 'the RSA'.
64		I fully support you and your colleagues, and thank you for all you're doing.							
65		Having perused and cogitated conclude that the proposals are eminently sensible, workable and sustainable. All effort greatly appreciated.							
66		Think you and your group have done outstanding and necessary suggestions for keeping RSA meaningful. Congratulations!							
67		Rely on members like you to "steady the ship" which I am confident you will do.							
68		I am writing in support of two particular recommendations made in the General Review and broadly welcome the many							

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
		other recommendations made.							
69		Wholly in favour of the proposed changes							
70		Vote in favour of the changes proposed. I believe that the current proposal will strengthen the Society, bring the present committee structure up-to-date and modernise the election procedures.							
71		In favour							
72		I would like to record my support for the Governance Advisory Group's recommendations.  Please listen to the often-silent majority and support these recommendations in full.							
73		I fully endorse the measures outlined. The overall tenor appears both wise and thoroughly researched.							
74		It seems to me that aligning the RSA with current best practice in the charitable sector and in line with Companies Act, is a worthwhile objective.							
75		This is to confirm my broad support for the GAG proposals as a constructive way forward for Fellows.							
76		I am fully in favour. The GAG proposals fill me with eager anticipation; I am sure that they will lead to greater involvement of a wider field of Fellows.							
77		I do broadly welcome the new proposals for consultation. However, I am a little concerned as to what appears to be restricted scope to appeal when Fellows go through an Expulsion process.					A 2 stage process may exhaust or even limit the Fellow facing expulsion to 'restricted' opportunity for their voice to be heard.		
78		I would simply like to express my support for the new governance proposals.							
79		I firmly believe that the GAG proposals							

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
		offer a constructive way forward for our Fellowship.							
80		I am supportive of the review proposals. I think these provide a clear, transparent and accountable way forward for the governance of the RSA.			The one area that remains a concern is the increase in recommended thresholds for the number of fellows required to call a meeting or set down a resolution.				
81		I'm emailing to express my support for the proposed changes.							
82		I would like to express my positive agreement for the GAG proposals to go forward and not be stopped, we must always strive to put the word and knowledge forward by all means and stopping this idea would be negative.							
83		These seem like good sense to me: a more representative, transparent, accountable organisation is certainly desirable, and I applaud the GAG's thorough investigation of the available options for reform.							
84		On the whole I fully support and endorse the GAG's recommendations, which are most timely and welcome.							
85		I am in favour of these revised proposals. However, there is merit in retaining the existing 3-year term for general committee members (plus opportunity for a second 3 year term) rather than reducing it to potentially 2 terms of 2 years.		Absence from 3 consecutive meetings should be recommended					
86		Just want to register my support or the GAG proposals.							
87		The GAG has done great work and I am broadly in agreement with the findings of the Governance Review.							I would welcome to see a less London centric focus and would encourage a greater profile for UK

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
									wide events, perhaps in partnership with other organisations and /or in association with Board and Fellowship Council meetings outside London.
88		The general picture does seem healthy enough if the political machinations make it onto the statute books; they seem to have undergone a very rigorous process on the way, and I wish you well as you steer things through.							
89		The Governance Review is timely as are the steps intended to strengthen the Nations and Regions working together to promote the aims of the RSA.						The concept of Regional Teams and the idea of agreed Development Plans should be workable.	
90		I wish, in the strongest possible terms to support the GAG proposals. They are a clear and necessary means of us driving the Fellowship forward.							
91			I would hope that all co-opted trustees would be Fellows. Surprised that only 6 to be elected – would have thought split of 8 / 4 would be more		The norm is 5% of membership to call for a meeting – I would have thought that would be more appropriate and would deter unhelpful intervention		Not particularly happy that there are only three members of an appeals committee, and no appeal – if there were more members the absence of a right to appeal would be more understandable	I would have thought reports from regions would be more frequent and more current	
92		I wish to indicate that I am broadly in favour with the recommendations.							
93		In general I approve of the recommendations re governance. Congratulations to you and the group for a superb effort. The role of the network manager in the regional teams needs to be clearer.						The 2 year period is too short. 3 years is preferable.	The relationship between Regional Committee's and the regional teams should be stated more clearly and earlier.
94		Thank you for leading this effort.	While the concept of "co-opted board members" is common and an efficient way to ensure a balance of	Too big. This may increase participation but at the expense of					

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
			skills, in a membership organisation I believe that the member should have the right to appoint all board members. Therefore, I suggest that the board puts up for election a slate in addition to the slate that emerges from applications submitted to nominations committee.	effectiveness.					
95		I like the RSA's change in orientation towards a little more building-companies-for-the-future spirit and a little less community-for-community's-sake mentality.	More democracy would be great.						
96		The review recommendations are suitably comprehensive and reasonable and will benefit the RSA and members in the future.							
97		I would support your initiative for such changes to be implemented. I know that you envisage more balanced governance enabling more regional voice and autonomy. This is in my humble opinion a step in the right direction as the provinces comprise many fellows who have much to offer but do not always work in the city.							
98		I would just like to express my support for the RSA GAG proposals - I believe that these proposals offer a constructive and progressive way forward for our Fellowship.							
99 100 101 102 103		Agree with most of the recommendations.  We are not persuaded that the proposals for regional teams are the "best practice option".	Agree  We regard the recommendations on the Trustee Board and Fellowship Council as sensibly consistent with the desire to achieve more extensive and effective representation of Fellows' voices and enabling greater participation by Fellows	Agree  If a Regional Chair does not wish to take up the position on the FC her/himself, there should be an option for the region to nominate a	Agree	Agree	Agree	We are less positively impressed, especially with the apparently 'managerialist' character of some parts of the proposals and a possible tendency towards needless	

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Terms of Office, Officers chosen among the Board, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
			in the life and work of the Society.	substitute for the Regional Chair.				uniformity across very diverse regions.	
104		I would like to register my support for your proposals.							

**Arguments Against:**

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
1			I do not accept parity between elected and non-elected members of the Board. A ratio, perhaps, of 8 elected and 4 co-opted members might be better. Any scrutiny of nominations for election by the Nominations Board should be purely advisory. It should not have the power to block any nomination for election - although it might indicate whether it approves or disapproves of each candidate.		It would be rare for any fellow to be able to canvass this level of support from amongst the Fellowship unless there were to be a lower threshold		I do not support the use of quantitative measures. They will not serve any purpose other than to annoy and demotivate Fellows.		The RSA at John Adam Street would be required to circulate all the membership with details of a proposed call for an SGM or resolution and then the proposed higher threshold could be the hurdle to be overcome for such Calls to be activated.
2		The GAG committee seems to have either not understood the setup of the RSA or are playing with numbers. The proposals are unrealistic and unworkable.  I am sorry to be so negative but strongly urge the review be scrapped completely and that GAG starts again.			Wales region has a total of around 500/600 regional members. Should an issue specifically affecting Wales that members felt required the calling of a SGM, then something close to 100% of Welsh members would be needed to call it - not 1.9% as quoted.				Would JAS supply a complete list of Fellows in Wales to any Fellow wishing to call a SGM? Or even e-mail on behalf of a Fellow all the necessary information to invite all Welsh Fellows to sign up? I somehow doubt it!!
3		At a time when government is moving away from targets and centralised control I find it ironic that their use is being recommended here.							
4		Given the range of talents and skills available within the membership I think it rare that co-option would be necessary. I would be prepared to segment the governing body so that we had to elect a range of interests if that was considered necessary.	Democracy is always a good thing even if it is sometimes uncomfortable.						
5			The Trustee Board should comprise a majority of persons who are elected by the Fellows. It is wrong that a Fellow should be denied the ability to stand for election because his or her skills do not fit a profile determined by the Nominations Panel.		Cannot support the proposal that 250 Fellows should be required to support a motion before it may be placed on the agenda of the AGM. This is far too high.				

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
6		I respond as one who is very unhappy with the review. What happened to the widespread consultation that was supposed to happen; it is usual to consult prior to producing recommendations. Who elected the Governance Advisory Group?	The Board should be fully elected, as should Regional Committees, as should the Nominations Committee				Any Fellow under threat of expulsion must, if natural justice is to be seen to be done, have a right of appeal		
7		Having read through the recommendations presented to the Fellowship, I have a great many concerns about the involvement of the wider fellowship in the governance of its organisation.	The whole document reads as though a small elitist group will have power to approve even nominations for office, expel Fellows for whatever reason they see fit on the day and generally hold total sway over what happens.				The proposals for expulsion read as though misbehaviour by Fellows is a daily occurrence requiring Draconian measures to control.		
8			The Proposed Bye-Laws 2011 Rule 3.6 provides a potential route through which the Fellowship Council can add Trustees by electing Trustees just prior to the conclusion of their Term of Office on the Fellowship Council. This route should not be allowed		Any proposed increase from 25 to 250 Fellows in Bye-Law 11.4 would be viewed to be unworkable, and without doubt rejected.		Expulsion of Fellows indicates that a recommendation is to be made to remove the right of appeal	The 2 year term appears to be a point of potential conflict with respect to the 3 year term of Trustees.	
9		I strongly oppose them.  Sent a letter to Fellows re: Urgent Concern RSA Governance Proposals							
10		Sent a letter to Fellows of South West and West re: Urgent Concern RSA Governance Proposals							
11		I am not convinced that the RSA has gone through a similar procedure to actively involve Fellows in the review of the governance structure. There does not seem to be open dialogue between Fellows about their concerns about governance or about ways to improve this.	If the majority of board members can be co-opted and are not even required to be Fellows then this reduces the capacity of Fellows to influence the future of the Fellowship through the election of board members.		The capacity of Fellows to table motions for the reform of the Fellowship is greatly undermined by the proposed requirement that 250 Fellows must previously have indicated their support for such a motion.		There appear to be undemocratic procedures for enabling the expulsion of critical Fellows from the Fellowship.		

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
12		Sent a letter to Fellows of South West and West re: Urgent Concern RSA Governance Proposals							
13		I have decided to leave the RSA because I feel that its centralised structure does not reflect the vibrancy experienced as an active local member.							
14		In summary I believe the proposal will dilute the participation of the Fellows in the running of our society.	The majority of members of the Board should be elected by the membership.		The threshold for unwinding the arrangement will make it difficult for the membership to influence the future direction of the Fellowship.				
15		I have read the recommendations document and feel it is all too complicated as a means of developing a governing body.	It would be much better to have a fully democratic process whereby all members of the governing committee are elected by members of the Association. Obviously the existing committee can make recommendations but any member can stand. This applies also to any regional committees.		The % you quote is well and good for a relatively small organisation where members are likely to know a significant number of the members. For the RSA, it is totally inappropriate.				
16		I have read the RSA Governance Review 2011 which you forwarded to me. I have also reflected upon the views expressed in a paper sent to you from Eric Albone, Kevin Cahill, Max Comfort and Rudi Plaut.	I am concerned in that it would seem to me that their views have a great deal of substance and that they should not be set aside without in-depth face-to-face consultations with these Fellows.						
17		I understand that "to arrive at their recommendations the Group (GAG) is to seek the informed views of Fellows in all parts of the world with meetings, notices and articles as seems most effective and efficient to them". I don't think I have been consulted in the forming of these recommendations. It feels sort of after the event to me.	Trustees they should be drawn from amongst the Fellows – possibly with some time / benchmark such as "having been a Fellow for one year".						

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
18		Having read the proposals of the new RSA Governance Proposals I no longer wish to be connected with the RSA and wish to cease my fellowship.							
19		I have attended the last AGM and am very disappointed the RSA has not seen fit to embrace democracy even after we have voted for it. I urge you and your colleagues to think again, particularly as so many of us feel our concern is not being seriously considered.							
20		I am concerned that the Fellows have been presented with so substantial and important a document with so short a deadline for comment, with no examination of options, and with no attempt to explain the problem to which the proposals are perceived to be the answer.							
21			It is entirely wrong to have equal numbers of co-opted and elected Board members. The majority should be elected. I also believe that all those co-opted should be RSA Fellows.		The proposed requirements for tabling a motion/resolution at AGM/SGM make me suspicious. To demand as many as 250 in an organisation as widely spread as the RSA looks like a device to suppress awkward proposals.		I am uneasy about the proposed absence of any right of appeal against expulsions.		
22		I thought that the Governance Review was intended to "present an opportunity to ensure that the governance (of the RSA) is modern, effective and controlled by the Fellows whose Society it is". It appears that the proposals move the society in the opposite direction. I am not aware that there has been widespread discussion or consultation with members until after proposals have been drawn up.	There should be a majority of "elected" Board members. The proposed Trustees Code of Conduct should be circulated and discussed.		The hurdle to table a motion should be substantially reduced from the proposed 250.		There should be a right of appeal for Fellows facing expulsion.	A majority of Regional Committees should be elected. Funding proposals should be re-considered.	

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
23		I am a little concerned that in this instance too much weight has been given to the practicalities of administration to the detriment of democracy. The recommendations make me feel uneasy for the future of the RSA; we have a duty as Fellows to consider future Fellows and the recommendations will not encourage new Fellows.	To be democratic there should be more elected Board members than co-opted Board members, and co-opted Board Members should also be Fellows of the RSA.		Why do you need 250 Fellows to table a motion at an AGM?		Does the procedure for appeal give a right of appeal at first instance? It seems not. It may seem wearisome but bearing in mind natural justice, I would prefer to see a right of appeal on such an important issue.	Regional Teams to replace Regional Committees. Fine though I am not sure I understand the purpose for the change; what is not fine is that only the Chair is to be elected. In my view the Teams should consist of more elected Fellows than co-opted Fellows.	
24		The consultation has all been a waste of time as very little of what the RSA Fellowship at large has said or objected to seems to have been taken on board by the GAG.	A 50/50 elected and co-opted Board is NOT acceptable.  The powers you propose to give the Panel are excessive and a slur on the character and status of our Fellows	In the event a Regional Chair does not want to serve on the Council, their replacement should be a matter for the Region's committee NOT the undefined "Team"	Your proposals fit the name of GAG completely!		If you change this and then endeavour to expel a Fellow be prepared for that expulsion to be challenged by the Courts (and overturned as being unlawful and contrary to public good.)	A Chair imposed on a region who has no previous experience of the direction in which that region is going will be courting disaster. Two years in office is insufficient	
25		Suports the comments of Joyce Arram							
26		There is a great danger that the RSA will be seen to be based on comfortable London-centric elite, rather than involving and making best use of the fellows in the regions. Attacking people who hold genuine concerns in this manner rather compound the sense of disenfranchise.							

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
27		Supports Joyce Arram. The overall impression - perhaps not one intended - is of a central body that aims to hold the reins and achieve control of 29,000 members.							
28		Supports Joyce Arram.							
29		Supports Joyce Arram.							
30		I too am extremely concerned about the future of the RSA and want to see it go from strength to strength. I do not believe that the proposals by GAG will achieve this.			No real explanation is given yet on why it is necessary to make it impossible for a Fellow to call an EGM or propose a motion for the AGM by restrictive numbers. Quoting the number of Fellows in a worldwide organisation is really not good enough.		What is the point of a Fellow who has been expelled having the right to be heard, if there is no right of appeal? - It does not make sense.		
31		I am concerned that the governance proposals, and particularly the rejection of the proposal that all Trustees are elected, gives too much power to the executive to lead.	I do believe that all Trustees should be elected since, unlike many charities, you are not ever likely to be in a position to need to find skills from outside the membership to enable effective governance.						
32		I feel I must support the anxiety being expressed by fellows from the South West.							You and your colleagues in London should invite Eric and his colleagues to come and discuss their concerns with you to see if a mutually acceptable solution can be found.
33		We consider you should provide all Fellows with any proposed revisions before the AGM with time for further comment.	There should be a majority of elected members, say 7 to 5.		We consider that either the number of Fellows required to table a motion be reduced or a mechanism be established so that resolutions can be pre-tested by communication of drafts widely before the formal process of tabling.		We consider a three stage process is appropriate and would protect RSA against any adverse criticism or even litigation.		We need to see a mechanism which permits resolutions of concern to a reasonable number of Fellows (such as those at the 2010 AGM) to come forward.

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
34		Supports A F Jeans. Same comments							
35		It is with deep disappointment that I feel obliged to respond to the recommendations with such dissatisfaction. Given the blatant disregard to the agreed process of consultation, I find myself unable to have confidence in the true objective. and therefore the outcomes being proposed	I will not support the current proposal. Nothing less than a 9:3 ratio of elected to appointed Trustees will give Fellows an effective opportunity to shape the direction and activities of the Society	It has the potential to centralise all deliberations on RSA matters	I find the proposal to increase the number at best insensitive at worst decidedly provocative				
36		The principle has always been that the Membership elect those people that they consider worthy to represent them in between Annual General Meetings.	Allowing too many co-opted members leads to all kinds of possibilities for nepotism, cliques, corruption etc.					Regions must be allowed to elect their own chairs, not have an apparatchik foisted upon them. What is it that you are frightened of?	
37		I remain unconvinced of the merit of not moving to an all-elected Trustee Board.	It is pity that the proposed governance structure seems to show little enthusiasm for setting a new and better standard, rather than remaining bogged down by existing standards and those that other not-for-profit organisations deem to be appropriate.						
38		Support the Letter by the Four Fellows. I felt marginalised by the RSA despite attending events both locally and in Bristol (and London) to stay active. The spirit of the currently proposed changes seems to be to move in the opposite direction.			The absolute number of Fellows needing to be conscripted to a proposed motion is so large (250) and what the Society does to facilitate democratic activity through this means.				I would like to be assured that, should I wish to canvas support for a motion I would be provided with (for example) all email addresses of Fellows, and contacting them (all if appropriate) would be facilitated by those in a position to do so at John Adam Street
39			The FC representatives should be classified as co-opted since they will be selected by the Nominations Panel.		Will suppress any expression of opinion by Fellows. This makes it clear that the Board wants the subscriptions not the opinions. Keep it as it is.				

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
40			I have been used to voting on the basis of a personal statement of objectives by candidates for appointment and my preference is therefore for a fully elected Board.  Treasurers however should be appointed or co-opted on the basis of their expertise.		My preference would be for a lower number, than set out in the Report, being able to call a SGM or table a resolution at the AGM and would be happy to see the existing number of Fellows retained as at present.				
41		The RSA seems to have drifted away from the Fellows.	Trustees should come from those who have been Fellows for at least a year. It is highly desirable that the majority of Trustees are elected by their colleague Fellows. The term of service should remain as currently, 6 years with an option to remain for 9.		The suggestion that 250 Fellows should be required to propose a motion at an AGM/SGM is not desirable.				Trustee proposals and Fellows proposals should have similar access to table resolution.
42			In any democratic institution the governing board should be elected. The ratio of elected to appointed trustees should be at least 9:3.		The recommendation that any motion would have to be backed by 250 Fellows is totally unacceptable.		This is a matter of concern, especially as there is no right of appeal.	Proposals regarding the regional structure requires further discussion.	
43		I do have some concerns that the Society is becoming less democratic in its dealings. I would like to register my view that the balance of 'power' should remain with Fellows across the Society including the Regions, and not with co-opted specialists.							
44		Supports Joyce Arram.  The tenor of present proposals to be entirely on the wrong track/tack.							
45		This is misguided and wrong.	In an accountable governance arrangement, the elected members should be in the majority with co-opted members being added to complete/complement the skill set of the (elected) Board. 8 members should be elected and up to 4 co-opted.		It would be impolitic to introduce these changes at this time. They will inevitably be regarded as being anti-democratic.				

No.	Name	Overall Comments	Creating a Parity Board, Officers chosen among the Board, Terms of office, Nominations Panel	Fellowship Council	Increasing Threshold	Removal of Trustee	Expulsion of Fellows	Regional Structure	Communication
46			The proposals allow non-Fellows to be co-opted onto the Board of Trustees. I can see absolutely no reason for this – with 27,000 experienced Fellows in all walks of life and the ability to commission expert advice the RSA is the last organisation to need non-elected or non-transparently co-opted Fellows on the board.		If an organisation gets bigger it needs a lower, not a higher, threshold/proportion of members to trigger a motion to AGM. Unless, of course, the intention is to limit Fellows making suggestions to the Fellowship as a whole.			Regional and local engagement is core to most peoples' experience of the RSA and frankly, I've not been at all impressed.	
47		<p>I fear that the proposals brought forward do not appear to meet the letter, let alone spirit, of the motion passed by Fellows which led to the establishment of the Governance Advisory Group.</p> <p>All this 'reinforcement of central control' will do nothing to address the problems facing the RSA</p> <p>I do not feel I can support these proposals</p>	The provisions which appear to authorise the Nominations Committee and / or Trustees to go beyond the traditional role - of finding good people with complementary skills - to veto candidates for election, even to expel Fellows with very limited rights of appeal, are oppressive.		The provision requiring 250 members to sign a proposal for a motion prevent any future motions which might 'challenge', even perhaps inconvenience, the RSA's central establishment.		The provision which cites 'bringing the Society into disrepute' as grounds for expulsion rings immediate alarm bells.	The tone of the document is that, as far as Governance of RSA is concerned, what is sought is a 'quietist' Fellowship, who will passively support the Society through its subscriptions; an ironic contrast to what the RSA seeks to achieve in the wider public sphere.	