

SSR Survey on Membership - 2003

The Challenge:

Assessing the Society's role and future goals.

Started as a forum for education and comradery, this group is known for its open discussion, forward thinking and clear focus on all things Musculoskeletal. The group has taken on new responsibilities including developing a political presence in the ACR and becoming the voice of musculoskeletal imaging in socioeconomic matters.

The Question:

Should the membership rules and requirements be modified to become less restrictive? More restrictive?

Potential outcomes:

Pros and cons of less restrictive membership rules (one might assume the opposite with more restrictive rules):

Pros

- *Increased number of members
- *Increased political clout with ACR
- *Increased opportunity for political clout in socioeconomic issues in musculoskeletal radiology
- *Ongoing infusion of new and enthusiastic members
- *Continued encouragement of cutting edge problem-solving by having the dedicated MSK imagers share w/ those w/more diverse interests
- *Increased dues revenue
- *Continued support of younger MSK specialists by more experienced imagers.
- *Less membership committee hassle with admission/maintenance of the membership

Cons

- *Loss of the intimate feel of the meetings
- *Increased meeting costs
- *Increased administrative costs
- *Potential for diluting the subspecialty population
- *Potential to decrease the educational quality of the program
- *Less opportunity for open-forum discussion at meetings
- *Potential shift in the primary goals of the group by those without a primary MSK interest

Additional issues:

1. Should Canadian members be included as Active members group with full voting rights and the opportunity to hold office or should they be included in the international member category with attendance rights but no vote?
2. Should we require a certain baseline level of involvement, training and or interest for entrance into the group? [Currently >50% MSK (multi-modality, not just MRI) and referral from active member. Training completed.]
3. Should we require on-going proof of >50% MSK practice to maintain membership?
4. Should there be a participation requirement such as meeting attendance at least once every three years? Publication/presentation at least once every three years?

What do you think? We want to know!

The SSR membership should become:

- Less restrictive
 More restrictive
 Stay the same

Comments: _____

Canadian members should be included as full active members with full voting rights:

- YES NO

Comments: _____

Baseline requirements for membership should be changed:

- YES NO

Comments: _____

There be participation requirements for continued membership in SSR:

- YES NO

Comments: _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: _____

**Please fax this page to SSR Offices at 703-757-0454
Please complete and send prior to October 10, 2003**

2003 SSR Ad Hoc Committee

Carol L. Andrews, M.D. Chairman
Bonner W. Guilford, M.D.
John C. Hunter, M.D.
David A. May, M.D.

Ted T. Miller, M.D.
Mark D. Murphey, M.D.
Chris A. Nusser, M.D.
Hilary R. Umans, M.D.