The SRNT 2025 Strategic Review is a 15 month-long process that the Board of Directors has undertaken in order to identify and address factors that we believe will impact the Society over the next 7 - 10 years. The goal is to arrive at member-informed conclusions, recommendations, and ultimately, Board actions that will set the stage for SRNT’s future relevance, integrity, and sustainability.
DATE, TIME & LOCATION

SRNT Board of Directors Session
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
San Francisco, California

INTRODUCTION

Executive Director Bruce Wheeler opened the meeting at 8:05 am with a short introduction of JFB & Associates’ CEO Pat Sterner, session facilitator.

Pat reviewed the agenda for the morning session, emphasizing desired outcomes and noting her role to ensure that Board deliberations result in action.

DISCUSSION: KEY THEMES AND ISSUES

The Board reviewed the key themes and issues, with consensus that they are relevant and create appropriate context for the deliberations to be undertaken by the Work Advisory Groups. The Board identified certain topics missing from the current narrative and had extensive discussion around the meaning or purpose of advocacy for SRNT, membership, transdisciplinary science, and SRNT’s leadership role.

There was a request that JFB develop a document as a ‘launching pad’ for the Work Advisory Groups to provide a common understanding of SRNT as it currently operates; its stakeholders, policies, and mission.
DISCUSSION: KEY THEMES AND ISSUES, CONTINUED

Topics that transcended specific Work Advisory Groups, yet relate to either all or individual Work Advisory Groups were:

**Research Priorities and Funding**

The Board identified three categories to this discussion:

a) Advocacy and its role in influencing funding to N&T science. This can be addressed in the discussions on SRNT’s role and purpose in advocacy.

b) Funders and their role in influencing research priorities. SRNT does not necessarily have influence on funders but could be responsible for tracking and reporting. This, too, could be considered in the advocacy discussion.

c) Members and the impact on their participation in SRNT based on where their funding comes from. This must clearly be addressed in the membership discussion.

- Who can be SRNT members?
- Who can present at conferences?
- How can the membership deliberations lead to a clearly articulated and transparent SRNT position on membership and participation by representatives and others affiliated with the Tobacco Industry and e-cigarette companies?

SRNT’s policy on membership is ‘easy and messy’. There must be further clarification on SRNT’s current position of ‘no Tobacco Industry employees’ as members, which does not address those consultants and other ‘non-employees’ of the Tobacco and e-cigarette Industries who can now be members yet are seen as promoting the Tobacco Industry’s agenda.

There is concern that Tobacco Industry participation at SRNT meetings is perceived as SRNT endorsing the Tobacco Industry; there needs to be heightened messaging about and monitoring of Tobacco Industry presence. There must be real consequences for Tobacco Industry representatives and employees crossing the line in order to protect the SRNT brand. The ultimate goal is to remove any perception of SRNT ‘endorsement’ of the Tobacco Industry.
There was consensus for all Work Advisory Groups to include the following topics in their work:

- Transdisciplinary science. The Board agreed that the integration of disciplines is missing in the topics and needs to be addressed in all facets of the work ahead. The connection across disciplines at the conference in particular is of major value to members and one that the Board feels SRNT has moved away from in recent years. They noted the conference and the Networks as places to promote transdisciplinary work and discussion. They asked that this issue be considered in all Work Advisory Groups.
- SRNT position on e-cigarette companies versus Tobacco Industry participation that addresses the pervasive issue of divisiveness in the SRNT membership around Tobacco Industry influence.
- Work Advisory Group recommendations need to be considered within the context of available resources and capacity.
- Work Advisory Groups will be asked to take into consideration five SRNT Values:
  - International
  - Transdisciplinary Science
  - Open scientific forum
  - Development of scientists
  - Transparency

**SRNT Structure and Participation**

**Chair:** Jennifer McClure

1. Membership (Composition, Diversity, Expectations. Who sits at the table and what are the rules? Who is our audience?)
2. Annual Conference (Who is our audience?)
3. SRNT Branches (SRNT University, Networks, Journal)
Membership

The Board had a lengthy discussion about the benefits of SRNT membership, listing multiple areas of value:

• Programs
• Advocacy
• Partnerships
• Conference
• Communications
• Listserv
• Mentors, trainees

Questions for Consideration

• What is the value of SRNT to individual members and their careers? How are we articulating and promoting this value?
• What is SRNT’s role and/or responsibility in recruiting and training new researchers?
• What is the role and purpose of the Networks in engaging members and promoting value? This feels like an underleveraged resource.
• What guidelines should be established to ensure the Networks work together in order to take better advantage of the expertise and connections between the Networks?
• What is the synergy between SRNT-U and the Networks and how can we enhance it?
• There is concern that SRNT-U is giving access to members and non-members alike for no charge. What will be the value to members if SRNT-U is free?
• How can we rethink membership value, experience, and purpose? We need to consider new ways to address and provide benefit for membership: fees, value, entry, and use (Spotify).
• What value do and can Chapters bring to the membership discussion?
• What mentoring and training can or should SRNT or SRNT-U be providing to membership, and for what results?
DISCUSSION: KEY THEMES AND ISSUES, CONTINUED

Additional Considerations

Membership survey: ask members about location and costs as incentives for attendance.

Cannabis presents a growing challenge and opportunity. Where might this fit in the membership discussion as it relates to engaging researchers in this area? Should membership be confined to research linking cannabis use to tobacco/nicotine usage? Is there interest, and how might it grow SRNT membership? Do we want to go in this direction, especially as this seems to be primarily a U.S. issue?

SRNT Purpose and Role

Chair: Suchitra Krishnan-Sarin
1. Mission, Purpose (Science, Advocacy, Public Health. Who is our audience? What’s our brand?)
2. Leading the Field (Positions and Policies)
3. Developing the Next Generation of Researchers

Advocacy

There was significant discussion about advocacy and what exactly that means for SRNT. There are many definitions and perspectives about ‘advocacy’, especially as captured from the stakeholder survey and the leadership interviews. It was noted that SRNT has a “NicPac Committee” but has not had significant involvement even though this organization provides a portal for advocacy.

There was a request to clarify the difference between ‘advocacy’ and ‘lobbying’. Executive Director Bruce Wheeler explained the difference, saying that advocacy is promoting a position or educating about an identified issue. Lobbying is focused on securing votes for legislation beneficial to an organization or constituency.
Questions Asked by Board Members for Further Consideration

- What do we mean by ‘advocacy’? How do we interpret advocacy as impacts SRNT; i.e., dissemination and education (in our mission statement).
- How is advocacy relevant to other Societies and how can that inform SRNT’s future position?
- How can we better clarify the “What, How, Why” of advocacy, and how we determine the focus for SRNT members versus for the Field overall.
- We need to answer the question of “why” first...what do we want to achieve with advocacy, and to the benefit of which constituency or group(s)?
- Is there a role for SRNT-U in advocacy? (training, tools)

Further Consideration:

- SRNT needs to think more globally about advocacy and look at global examples. We cannot be only U.S. centric. We need global models of advocacy to consider.
- SRNT needs to have clarity and better communication to members what our positions are as relates to policy or advocacy.
- Advocacy is about dissemination. SRNT has to have an outward face.
- SRNT’s role should be advocating for more evidence; our positions should be driven by the science and convey the state of the science.
- SRNT Role and Value = leadership/out in front by defining the ‘why’ to all members.
- Be careful of ‘scope creep’ in this area; SRNT can develop and use partnerships to expand our influence in the area of advocacy.
- Dissemination and education do not live in a vacuum- there is an expectation from the members and other stakeholders that SRNT should take positions on different facets of the science.
- Communication to members and the public is necessary.
- Partnerships are key.
DISCUSSION: KEY THEMES AND ISSUES, CONTINUED

Additional Considerations

• Should SRNT be promoted as a resource for the general public?
• What is our responsibility to be the ‘go to’ source for the public; or should SRNT’s focus remain on being a resource primarily for scientists?
• What might this mean for advocacy and dissemination?
• Should SRNT continue on its mission of ‘stimulating’ the dissemination of the science, or should it be more pro-active in the dissemination of knowledge?

SRNT Global

Chair: Megan Piper
Co-Chair: Caitlin Notley
1. Defining ‘Global’ (Global vs. International. Who is our audience?)
2. Chapters (Policies, Expectations. Who is our audience?)
3. SRNT’s responsibility for engaging LMICs (Capacity versus Appetite)

Additional Considerations

• Understand more about tobacco policies in other countries and their impact on participation in SRNT.
• Be clear about the why and value of Chapters to scientists and to SRNT.
• Consider the feasibility of increasing participation from other countries.
The Board agreed that the three Work Advisory Groups presented should be the ones seated and confirmed the Chairs and Co-Chairs for each of the Work Groups. They agreed to forward a minimum of three names to Bruce Wheeler for consideration in populating the Work Groups. They identified the following characteristics as important for consideration in Work Group composition:

- International
- Cross-disciplinary
- Gender
- Early career
- Actively engaged as an SRNT member
- Thoughtful, open minded

**NEXT STEPS**

Pat reviewed next steps and timeline based on a Master Schedule (following).

**Master Schedule**

The following is a general timeline for the Work Groups. Work Group members can expect to receive materials in advance of each meeting, such as an agenda and background material for review. Advance preparation will be key to making the most of the meeting time.
### Activity Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item: Seat and Confirm Work Group Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>February 25 - March 8, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1 – Work Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review Work Group assignments. Identify key themes, critical questions to address, Work Group goals, and additional information or input required.</td>
<td><strong>March 11 - April 5, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 2 – Work Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review results of Membership Survey, apply to themes and questions. Develop initial opinions. Communication to the Board requesting feedback.</td>
<td><strong>May 13 - June 7, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 3 – Work Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review Board feedback. Develop initial recommendations for communication to the Membership for us in a Membership ‘Comment Period’. Status report to the Board.</td>
<td><strong>July 1 - July 26, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item: Membership Survey (development, launch, compilation)</strong></td>
<td><strong>April 8 - May 10, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 4 – Work Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review Membership Comments. Develop final recommendations to advance to the SRNT Board.</td>
<td><strong>August 15 - September 15, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item: Membership Comment Period</strong></td>
<td><strong>October 1 - October 25, 2109</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item: Work Group Recommendations Finalized and Reported to SRNT Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>By November 30, 2019</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The session adjourned at 11:30 am.