



Minutes of the Annual General Meeting

of

Association for Project Management

Held on Monday 19th November 2018

at

Princes Gate Heritage Room,

30 Euston Square, London NW1 2FB

Commencing at 10.30 am

Association for Project Management
Ibis House
Regent Park, Summerleys Road
Princes Risborough
Buckinghamshire
HP27 9LE

Chairman of the meeting: David Waboso, President of APM

Present: 17 full members were present, as detailed on the attendance list

In attendance: The Chief Executive, the Chief Financial Officer, the Company Secretary and others were in attendance.

Apologies: Apologies were received from Andrew Strickland (the external auditor), Alan Macklin, Rod Baker, Danny Trup and Mary McKinlay

Papers provided: Paper copies of the following were available for all attendees – Notice of the meeting, minutes of the previous AGM held on 21 November 2017, full annual report and accounts, the annual review summary and 33 questions received prior to the meeting with written answers. (Attached at Appendix 1)

Opening of the meeting

The President opened the meeting and welcomed those present.

1. President's address

The President addressed the meeting – APM had completed its first full year as a Chartered body and he wished to acknowledge the contribution of Sara Drake, APM's previous Chief Executive, in achieving this and wish her well. He was also delighted to have the opportunity to welcome Debbie Dore as APM's new Chief Executive. He wished to focus on two major achievements in the year; Namely, the development of strategy and the completion of APM's first year as a Chartered body. The consultation and development of the assessment process for achieving chartered status had been a significant achievement. It represented the profession coming of age. He expressed thanks to all the team involved in the Chartered work and to the Assessor community. Great feedback had been received from all stakeholders. The President read out some of the feedback received and acknowledged the huge success that had been achieved.

2. Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the company held on 21st November 2017

The minutes of the previous Annual General meeting were approved and signed by the Chairman of this meeting.

3. Receipt of the annual accounts of the company Association for Project Management for the year ended 31st March 2018, the report of the trustees and the auditors' report

The President invited the Chairman of the Board and the Chief Executive to present to the meeting on the strategy, the achievements of the year, the annual report and accounts for 2017/18, and forward plans.

The Chair of the Board opened the presentation. He explained that the Board had developed a strategy for APM and that over the last 12 months sub-strategies had been developed to deliver on the strategy. These were aimed at supporting delivery of the strategic objectives as follows:

1. **Chartered** – the first cohort had completed the process to become Chartered Project Professionals; a diverse range of sectors were represented with a high proportion from the pharma sector and there was also interest from large corporates to participate in future cohorts;
2. **Membership Growth** – in March 2018 APM had over 25,000 individual members and 600 corporate members; the growth in student membership should provide a pipeline for the future and a media campaign had been conducted earlier in the year to reach a wider audience;
3. **Knowledge & Research** – APM is investing over 2% of its revenues in research and the results are now coming through; APM is engaged with PwC in a significant piece of research on the contribution of project management and has published over 50 thought leadership papers;
4. **Organisational innovation** – APM has prepared for GDPR, created a Volunteering Future Strategy, and was pleased to appoint its new Chief Executive from within the organisation following an extensive recruitment process;
5. **Collaboration and engagement** – APM engages with key external bodies, has worked with the Major Projects Authority to deliver a thought leadership seminar, is engaging more closely with bodies such as the International Project Management Association;
6. **Delivering public benefit** – This has been achieved by such items as: supporting development of the Project profession to deliver better outcomes, advancing professional skills, responding to government consultations, investing in major research projects, benchmarking project management's wider economic contribution, developing project management as a career of first choice and making project management more accessible to the wider public.

The Chief Executive then presented on achievements during the past year, which included:

- Admission of the first cycle of Chartered Project Professionals (ChPPs) – applications had been received from a wide range of sectors, the youngest had been 29 and the oldest 70, 82% male and 18% female, seven from overseas and 13 non-members;
- Impact since the grant of the Charter – including 53,000 members of APM's LinkedIn group, 184 organisations accredited to deliver APM courses, growing membership, the new corporate partner programme and 6,000 participants in APM's salary survey;
- Key projects delivered in 2017-2018 included the ChPP project (which dominated work), GDPR preparedness, guidance on use of APM's Competence Framework, the launch of new IPMA qualifications and growth in the jobs board;
- Key projects for the current year include an improved joining process for MAPM, digital content strategy, My APM web portal, a clear career path, consultation on online qualifications, BoK7 going live in spring 2019, qualifications alignment to the new BoK7, investment in a new e-learning platform, investment to make APM more accessible, improving diversity and inclusion, conversion of students to full membership, improving relevance to SMEs and supporting the profession for the future through greater profile and visibility as a diverse profession. Additionally, CHPP being seen by employers as a 'must have', benefits and impacts becoming more important and better career pathways with project management being seen as a profession of first choice.

The Chief Financial Officer then presented on the 2017-2018 accounts, noting that:

- revenue had increased by 7.4%
- the deficit of £129,000 was lower than the budgeted deficit
- APM had just under £6 million assets at the year end
- 87% of APM's income came from membership and qualifications revenue
- main growth in revenue had been from qualifications – PMQ had 9,500 candidates

- events income had increased
- that higher costs included increased staff costs, £350,000 related to the Chartered transition, additional spend on the website.
- 2% of revenues were committed to research
- the Balance Sheet was strong
- there had been an increase on total numbers of 12%, mostly in student numbers
- there had been c500 ChPP applications to date
- in the current year revenues at the half year were £5.57 million, ahead of the prior year and total revenues should be in the region of £11 million at the year end.

Questions arising from the presentations followed:

Q – Is APM now seeing a higher rate of renewal of membership?

A – Retention rates were improving and APM has seen an increase of 8% in paying associates.

Q – In relation to diversity, is there a large difference between older and younger members?

A – This is a risk for all professional bodies. The data on this produced by the Professional Associations Research Network (PARN) is illustrative of this. It is a challenge to convert student members to full members.

Q – PPQ was not successful, but ChPP has been a great success – have there been lessons learnt from this?

A – APM did consult on PPQ but has learnt that it is better suited to an academic environment and is regarded as too onerous for employers. The assessment methodology was being reviewed. The public consultation regarding proposals for ChPP did result in changes as a result of that consultation which contributed to its success.

Q – Is APM doing anything at school level?

A – APM has conducted research and produced a toolkit for schools and now 184 schools are engaged. APM is also engaged with *Inspiring the Future*.

Q – Is APM intending to work to the introduction of project management at GCSE and A levels?

A – GCSE and A levels are highly regulated, and this would be extremely difficult to achieve. Project management is incorporated in the Business and IT qualifications and APM is also engaging with T levels as well as apprenticeships.

4. The APM Board election

The Company Secretary reported the results of the 2018 Board election as follows:

- APM has continued its upper quartile performance in terms of turnout - 18.4% achieved this year, which was a record turnout
- Under the Charter and Regulations, the election was undertaken as a poll vote with the ballot delivering proxies to the AGM
- There were 21 candidates for four vacancies
- The three candidates receiving the highest votes are elected for three-year terms and the fourth placed is elected for a two-year term.

The Company Secretary congratulated all those who participated and voted for a good election process. The result of the election was as follows:

Candidate

Votes

RESULT		4 to elect
LEWIS, Debbie	1162	ELECTED
GILBERT, Sorrel	1017	ELECTED
CARVER, Stephen	673	ELECTED
BROOME, Jon	654	ELECTED
SMALLWOOD, Nick	555	
KIDSTON, Paul	408	
GORDON, John	405	
PALCZYNSKI, Richard	404	
JONES, Allan	383	
CAMPLING, Rob	319	
MILLARD, Roy	312	
PARKES, Peter	306	
GODHAWALE, Anil	298	
BAKER, Rod	289	
RUNCIMAN, Charles (Neil)	256	
CRONE, Jonathan	250	
WYNNE, Daniel	238	
REESON, Mark	210	
JOBY, Roger	204	
JAUNDRILL, Darren	196	
COCHLIN, Neil	158	

Therefore, Debbie Lewis, Sorrel Gilbert and Stephen Carver were elected to the Board for a period of three years and Jon Broome was elected to the Board for a period of two years. John Gordon, Alan Macklin and Roy Millard were retiring from the Board at the end of the AGM.

5. Members' questions

The President then turned to the members' written questions submitted in advance of the meeting. Twenty-four questions had been submitted and copies of the questions and written answers had been made available to all those attending the meeting. (Attached at Appendix 1).

The President then turned the pages of the printed questions and answers and asked if anyone wanted to comment or query further. The following were highlighted.

Q2 – A supplementary question was raised regarding whether it was now intended to change the name of APM to incorporate 'Chartered'. The Chairman of the Board explained that the Board had discussed this but felt at that time that there was a risk of losing brand awareness. This might happen at some point in the future. Whilst there was no current intention to apply for an amendment to the Charter to change the name, the Board would review in the next 12-24 months.

Q7 – A supplementary question was raised regarding the growth of paid membership, stating that the growth targets appeared low. The Chief Executive explained that it was important to set targets that people believe they can achieve and the Chairman of the Board asked the meeting to note that growth

had been achieved during a period of austerity. It was suggested from the floor of the meeting that APM should work to offer a better value proposition to its members.

Q8 – A supplementary question was raised regarding the turnover of members of the Board and the need for a formal, rigorous and transparent process for the appointment of Trustees to the Board. It was queried why the board Chair had not submitted himself for election. The Company Secretary explained that the Board was able to appoint people in accordance with the requirements of the Charter who the Board felt had the necessary knowledge, qualities and experience to fulfil the role. A vacancy for an appointed position was currently being advertised as part of a transparent process. Previously APM had not done that and this was a response to a recommendation in the previous Board evaluation and was also now suggested best practice in the new Charities Governance Code. For several years, the Board has completed and considered a skills matrix and examined possible gaps. For example, Dr Paul Chapman had been re-appointed to the Board as no other trustee had experience of academia. The Chairman had been appointed by the Board to provide continuity in the role of Chairman. This followed a recommendation made by an independent external Board evaluation regarding the need for longer appointment terms for the Chairman. It was appropriate for the Board to determine who it wished to be its Chair from amongst its number.

A point was raised from the floor of the meeting by a member expressing disappointment regarding comments made on social media during the 2017 Board election and expressing the view that people who behaved in that way should be sanctioned. The President said that he would encourage people to think carefully before they post comments on social media. The Company Secretary added that the APM Guide to Social Media had recently been updated and election rules had also been updated to make expectations clear; APM does monitor social media and will approach those responsible in appropriate cases to ask them to remove content. He confirmed that APM's Code of Professional Conduct and the accompanying disciplinary process might be applied in extreme cases. The Chief Executive undertook to review the Social Media Guidance to see if references to the Code of Professional Conduct should be strengthened.

POST MEETING NOTE – The APM Guide to Social Media is available in the Volunteers' area on ProjectPlace and the APM social media house rules are available on the website at <https://www.apm.org.uk/the-community-house-rules/>

The President then made closing remarks. The Chairman of the Board thanked everyone for attending, expressed thanks to the trustees leaving the Board and welcomed the new trustees joining.

The meeting closed at 11.35am.

Chairman _____

Appendix - written Members' Questions & written answers 2018 APM Annual General Meeting

Question by Hugo Minney

1. **What is, or will be, APM strategy for engaging with corporate members?** I believe that the relevance of APM starts with employers. If employers value professionals (membership and accreditation), then employees and candidates will also value being a professional. If individuals (employees and candidates) seek accreditations, then education and training establishments will provide this. Our membership and profile grows. Having worked with our corporate members in the North East branch, I believe APM corporate engagement strategy could be improved.

APM has a dedicated business development team including Partner Development Managers (PDMs) whose role it is to build effective and sustainable relationships with key corporate contacts and each PDM has a portfolio of accounts that they manage in terms of regular meetings and staff presentations. In addition, the PDMs advise and support the corporates to align with and embed APM standards within their own career frameworks. (Competence Framework Tool, BoK, Qualifications, CPD, ChPP etc). The team is also responsible for seeking and increasing the pool of new affiliates and partners.

The PDM role ensures corporates have a direct and consistent link into the APM with continuous support to raise the standards of professionalism within each organisation. The PDMs act as key facilitators for our corporates, bringing the right people, knowledge and resources together to fulfil the corporate's needs to advance their PPM capability programmes. Each PDM has a link to a Branch region and often attend BCAG meetings where they exist to ensure consistency of messaging and approach.

Question by Albert Lester

2. **Is it the intention of the APM Board to change the name of APM to incorporate the fact we are now chartered?** If it is, I suggest either Chartered Association for Project Management (CAPM), or Chartered Institution for Project Management (CIPM) or even more grandly, Royal Association for Project Management (RAPM). I appreciate that there may be a statutory delay period, but I think a ballot of the attendees of this AGM, and eventually the full membership, would show a preference for a change of name.

There are no immediate plans to change the name of the Association and the current approach of including the word Chartered in a tagline appears to be working well. An anecdotal warning has been passed to APM from another body which changed its name about the loss of brand awareness. However, the Board will review whether to consider a name change within the next 12-24 months. Market research will be required. For example, CAPM is a registered trademark of the Project Management Institute. CIPM is a common search term for the Chartered Institute of Personnel Development and RAPM is a well-known acronym in the field of pain management.

A formal change to the name would require a change to the Royal Charter. This which would need approval at a general meeting and by the Privy Council. Separate government approvals are also needed to use the words 'Royal' and 'Institute' in a company or trading name.

Question by Jon Broome

3. The following two web pages have been up for over a year now on the APM website :
- <https://www.apm.org.uk/about-us/apm-strategy/> posted late June / early July 2017
 - <https://www.apm.org.uk/blog/inspiring-positive-change/> posted by John McGlynn on 11th July 2017.

Both include a link to each other to “read more” but pretty much say the same thing. There is also a link to a download, which is a one page visual summary of the ‘Strategy’. All these pages only contain vision, mission and 5 objectives.

While most definitions of strategy include the setting of objectives, they almost all make reference to the planning and actions needed to achieve to achieve them. In other words, what is posted on the website cannot really be considered a strategy by almost all definitions.

Merv Wyeth Secretary, Benefits Management SIG and Neil White Chair, Benefits Management SIG in a question posted on 12th July 2017 on John McGlynn’s blog, drew attention to the circular nature of web pages and asked: *“We would expect a strategy to be telling us what the APM intends to do and why. Is the strategy accompanied by a delivery plan that explains what we, as members and volunteers, can do to help with its execution? ... The five objectives are not as “SMART” as we would expect, particularly for a project management organisation. How are we, as the APM, too know whether we have achieved these objectives, and what is the time scale? [At least the previous version, Strategy 2020, was explicit about when the strategy would be achieved] Thanks.”*

To date there has been no response. Please can the board give details – i.e. more than the high level annual measures on p.16 of the annual report - of the SMART objectives, lead and lag KPIs etc, and an overview of the governance process for initiating projects, reviewing their progress and whether they are achieving the intended benefits. Without these in place, I do not know how the board can fulfil its first ‘role’ as stated in successive Trustee reports i.e. “The board sets APM’s strategy and monitors its implementation, assuring itself that performance is on track.”

There is considerable detail behind the five high level objectives and each have one, three and five-year time horizons and objectives. Some of this detail is commercially sensitive and not for publication. Responsibility for monitoring and supporting performance rests with the Board which regularly considers these matters in detail. The detailed horizons are reflected in the three-year business plan and delivery is tracked against a set of Board approved KPIs.

The members’ annual review and the detailed annual report and accounts available at the AGM highlight key achievements in line with the objectives. There are also a set of sub-strategies outlining the approach to be taken in key areas which have been reviewed and approved by the Board. Further detail has been shared with APM’s volunteer community, including at the November Volunteers’ Forum. The presentation at the AGM by the Chair and Chief Executive will focus on achievements and progress against the strategy.

Question by Jon Broome

4. Related to the previous question, can the board explain why its 'strategy' sub-committee no longer exists, as it was identified as a sub-committee in its 2015/16 and 2016/17 reports, but is not in its 2017/18 report.

The Board reviews its sub-group structure regularly. Changes are common and reflect current priorities as well as recommendations from the annual Board evaluation reviews.

The Strategy Committee was established to help in the development of the *Inspiring Change* strategy and this work has now completed. Details of the current Board sub-groups and their remit is available in the *About Us* section of the APM website.

The Board has also established an External Affairs Consultative Group which is undertaking a 'horizon scanning' function and is due to publish its first output in the new year.

Question by Jon Broome

5. I assume there is a Project Management Office within Ibis House to support those doing the projects, ensure they are done in a sufficiently consistent manner and ensure governance. Please can we have some details of how it does this so that members can have confidence that APM practises what it preaches.

Some development is delivered through BAU activity in teams and others through a project portfolio. There is a project portfolio team in place to manage APM's portfolio. Activity follows best practice and portfolio governance was recently reviewed by the Board's Audit & Assurance Committee. The Committee was satisfied and complementary about how processes are managed. There is regular reporting on each project and programme to the Board.

Question by Jon Broome

6. The APM Strategy of July 2017 (see my first question) has five key objectives: Chartered Standard, Membership Growth, Knowledge and Research, Organisational Innovation, and Collaborate and Engage. It is repeated in the Trustee's Annual Report for the year ended 31st March 2018 on p.11. I could not find the date of publication.

The APM Strategy of September 2018, as communicated by the CEO to SIGs on a webinar of 21st September 2018 has three "Key Themes for 2018/19" and to APM members, in the 'Project Pulse' email of 24th October where they are "three organisational objectives": Growth, Diversity and Alignment.

I.e. Only 'Growth' remains from the date of publication of the Trustees report, which can only be a matter of months ago. Can the board, who set strategy, explain what has happened to the other four objectives from 2017/18 as of 31st March 2018 and why the two new ones.

The strategic objectives remain the same and are driving activity. (See the answer to question 3 above). The presentation given to the Branches and SIGS ahead of their business planning round fully aligned to achievement of these objectives. The presentation highlighted the activity under 3 simple headings to make it easier in the planning process. It was also framed as being based on the specific areas which the branches and SIGs can help deliver.

Question by Jon Broome

7. Can the board state what its targets for growth of paid membership have been for the last 3 years and are for the next few years looking forward?

Prior to 2017/18 membership growth was based on all membership types and not just paid membership. Separate targets for paid membership were first set in 2017/18 at 5% well above organic growth trends assuming an uplift due to the announcement of charter which was not achieved. For 2018/19 they have been set at 3%. Targets for future years have not yet been determined.

Question by Jon Broome

8. Please could the following table be completed to provide transparency over where the change in membership numbers is coming from as I find the information given in the ‘Trustees’ annual report for the year ended 31 March 18 a little opaque.

Membership		Growth As		Growth As	
Grade	31/03/2016	Percentage	31/03/2017	Percentage	31/03/2018
Student	913	45.8%	1,331	177.7%	3,696
Associate	7,648	-3.0%	7,421	6.0%	7,865
Member	13,379	3.1%	13,800	-1.2%	13,631
Fellow	313	11.2%	348	14.7%	399
Others	103	-2.9%	100	0.0%	100
Total	22,356	2.9%	23,000	11.7%	25,691
Per Annual Report	22,356		23,000		25,691

Question by Jon Broome

9. Can the board give insight into the diversity of its paid membership i.e. age ranges; male/female/other; ethnicity, sector etc.. What is APM doing to address any age imbalances beyond the good work being done at HEI level ?

Diversity for APM goes beyond our Membership and is a critical part of our ongoing strategy. This includes driving engagement and diversity through the creation and support of appropriate and relevant communities of interest, such as by geography, as well as continuing to attract new corporate partners from a diverse range of sectors. The primary purpose of our Education Strategy and our support for schools and colleges, through outreach activity, is to ensure that project management is seen as a career of choice and/or a life skill for those still in education and is understood by career influencers. The expanded student membership proposition gives APM a route to engage meaningfully with 16+ students from the full range of subject backgrounds, to reflect the changing project population.

We can confirm that many chose not to provide data or to identify themselves in this way, however based on the information from those that are willing to share, we can supply the following details for our current Membership;

Gender

Male – 75%

Female – 25%

Ethnicity

Asian/Asian British - Bangladeshi	0.2%
Asian/Asian British - Chinese	0.9%
Asian/Asian British - Indian	3.0%
Asian/Asian British - Pakistani	0.7%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British – African	3.1%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British - Caribbean	0.7%
Mixed/Multi - White and Asian	0.6%
Mixed/Multi - White and Black African	0.1%
Mixed/Multi - White and Black Caribbean	0.2%
Other	5.0%
Other ethnic group - Arab	0.4%
White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	83.3%
White - Irish	1.8%

	Student	Associate	Member	Life Member	Fellow	Hon Fellow
Minimum age	18	19	24	49	31	43
Maximum age	61	76	90	80	89	94

Of the recent, 271 individuals who achieved Chartered Project Professional status and provided us with data, the details are as follows;

Male – 82%

Female – 18%

Youngest applicant: 29

Oldest applicant: 70

Question by Jon Broome

10. Could the Board provide the conversion ratio for those who stop being Student members and become Associate or full Members.

Six months into 2017/18 Financial year, 1,533 students joined APM, 3.5% of those have already converted into Associate and Full membership grades.

The conversion ratio from student membership to paying membership is quite low primarily because free student membership has only recently been opened up to both full and part time students, apprentices as well as students from any discipline. We are working hard to engage with student members and expect this conversion ratio to improve in the coming years once more of the student members complete their studies and move into employment.

Question by Jon Broome

11. Can you provide figures for membership turnover i.e. how many left in each of the preceding 3 years versus how many have joined.

Membership turnover

Summary

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Joined	4,105	5,089	7,453
Lapsed	3,357	3,884	4,760
Net change	748	1,205	2,693

Detail

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Joined			
Full Member	1,652	2,051	1,480
Associate	2,111	2,269	2,790
Student	202	712	2,979
Fellow	34	57	62
Other	106	0	142
TOTAL	4,105	5,089	7,453
Lapsed			
Full Member	1,342	1,420	1,702
Associate	1,839	2,280	2,345
Student	130	148	701
Fellow	21	22	12
Other	25	14	0
TOTAL	3,357	3,884	4,760

Question by Jon Broome

12. Can the board give a similar breakdown for Corporate Partners and Affiliates, in terms of grades, numbers and targets for the last 3 years. The only information given is that it has risen to "558 in the first year of the new structure". From what ?

The Corporate Partner programme was restructured during 2017/18. Corporate Partners transitioned from the old model to the new model at the date of their annual renewal. Annual renewals are staggered throughout the year. As a result of this phasing it is not possible to produce meaningful comparable data for the numbers of Corporate Partners between 2016/17 and 2017/18. However, the annual revenue from Corporate Partners increased from £408,766 in 2014/15 to £460,135 in 2015/16 (+13%) to £558,109 in 2016/17 (+21%) to £583,395 in 2017/18 (+5%).

In the old model corporate members were Project Management Communities rather than Corporations. In the old model a higher number of members paid lower individual fees. In the new model a smaller number of Corporate Partners pay higher individual fees. The combined numbers of Corporate Members and Corporate Partners were reported as follows in APM Annual Report and Accounts:

2015/16 597
 2016/17 604
 2017/18 558.

Question by Jon Broome

13. Does the board still have a “member’s champion”. One is not mentioned in this year’s report whereas in the 2016/17 report there was at least one for “corporate and individual members”.

There is no current board champion for individual membership.

Question by Jon Broome

14. The new ChPP qualification is called “Project Professional Qualification” (PPQ). It was launched on the 16th April 2016, two years ago. Expectations were that dozens of training organisations would offer the course with hundreds of candidates gaining the PPQ qualification each year.

Two questions :

- How many organisations are accredited and actually offer the course ?
- How many people have passed the 4 modules and have gained the full PPQ certificate?

There are currently 5 organisations accredited to offer PPQ with more expressions of interest also having been received from further organisations. There are currently 8 people who hold the PPQ, although additional people hold individual modules.

APM recognises that the PPQ in its current format does not meet the requirements of the market and has recently carried out market research to understand why. It is clear that there is a need for a qualification in this space and further work is being carried out to re-develop areas of PPQ to ensure it meets this need and remains as recognised assessment for the technical knowledge for ChPP.

Question by Jon Broome

15. The ‘Project Management Qualification’ PMQ is the level below PPQ with just one module exam which is handwritten. The syllabus has remained unchanged since its previous incarnation (APMP) was launched in 2012. What plans are there to modernise the syllabus and keep it up to date more quickly in the future? Is the exam held in any foreign language? How much is spent each year on postage (by examination centres) and by IBIS House in courier charges to move the paper scripts back and forth to examiners? What plans are there to reduce or eliminate the use of paper exams and hand marked paper scripts?

Until recently, the PMQ was dual certified as IPMA Level D, with requirements that the qualification was based on the APM Body of Knowledge. The syllabus against the Body of Knowledge 6th edition has been in place since 2012, with the 7th edition of the Body of Knowledge being released in Spring 2019 and updates to qualifications to follow. It would therefore not have been in line with the IPMA regulations to update the syllabus unless the Body of Knowledge was updated. The examination is currently only offered in English.

With regards to move away from paper scripts, APM have recently carried out market research to assess the appetite for moving the examination online and also different formats of assessment. The outcome of this research demonstrates that there is no desire to move to an alternative format for the examination and whilst there is interest in putting the existing

format online, there are also concerns around this. APM is currently reviewing a number of options with regards to online assessment and the research will feed into this.

In 2017-18 APM spent £36,518 on courier fees, which includes Project Fundamentals papers as well as PMQ papers. This is approximately £7.14 per PMQ applicant.

Question by Jon Broome

16. According to the Trustee's Annual Report for the year ended 31st March 2018, the APM apparently employed an additional 37 people (presumably excluding leavers) in the last financial year employing, as of 31 March 18, 101 people with a corresponding increase in staff costs. This gives a members to staff ratio of 254:1. This compares with, for instance :
- the Institution of Mechanical Engineers which had, at the end of 2017, a membership of 120,509 and 115 staff giving a ratio of 1049:1.
 - the Institution of Civil Engineers who, at the end of 2017, had a membership 92,157 and 223 staff giving a ratio of 413:1.
 - the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) which had, at end 2017, 25,154 members – a similar size to the APM - and 76 staff giving a ratio of 330:1.

In a brief run through other chartered membership associations, I could not find one with a higher ratio than APM. While 'economies of scale' is undoubtedly a factor, can the board or CEO give reasons for this high ratio, even compared with the RTPI, which has similar membership numbers, but 25% less staff.

Different professional bodies have different activities and priorities. It is not clear without further research whether the figures quoted are accurate or whether the selected benchmark of staff per member is the most useful comparator for these organisations. For example, whilst membership is a key part of APM's strategy, it is not its only focus or activity for the Association. APM supports over 17,000 thousand qualification takers per year, has hosted over 11,000 attendees at APM volunteer events or webinars and undertakes a range of other functions for the profession including standards, publications, research, volunteer support and advocacy.

There are other benchmarks which can be sourced and analysed and there is increasingly an attempt in the annual report to focus on impact and public benefit reporting. The Board has consciously invested in a staff structure and resource to drive its ambitious plans and economies of scale will increasingly be a factor. There are now no plans for any notable increase in headcount.

A more meaningful alternative benchmark may be to assess the number of employees against income. The table below uses figures obtained from the charity commission website. Out of a sample of 12 comparable organisations, APM ranks 7th, in line with the median for the group.

Additionally, the latest 2016 figures from the Professional Association Research Network (PARN) gives a median of 3.66 employees per 1000 members. This compares to a 2017/18 figure for APM of 3.93.

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Income</u>	<u>Average number of employees</u>	<u>Income per employee</u>	<u>Latest available report year end</u>
1 Chartered Institute of Procurement and Supply (CIPS)	£ 26,800,000	157	£ 170,701	31/10/2017
2 Institute of Risk Management (IRM)	£ 3,300,000	26	£ 126,923	30/06/2017
3 Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)	£ 22,000,000	178	£ 123,596	31/12/2017
4 British Computer Society (BCS)	£ 35,100,000	309	£ 113,592	31/08/2017
5 The Institution of Engineering & Technology (IET)	£ 61,800,000	578	£ 106,920	31/12/2017
6 Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)	£ 34,300,000	336	£ 102,083	31/12/2017
7 Association for Project Management (APM)	£ 9,900,000	101	£ 98,020	31/03/2018
8 The Chartered Institute of Marketing (CIM)	£ 14,200,000	146	£ 97,260	30/06/2018
9 Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)	£ 86,500,000	892	£ 96,973	31/07/2017
10 Chartered Management Institute (CMI)	£ 13,300,000	152	£ 87,500	31/03/2017
11 Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA)	£ 43,800,000	508	£ 86,220	31/12/2017
12 Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)	£ 6,400,000	76	£ 84,211	31/12/2017
		Median	£ 100,052	
		APM	£ 98,020	
		Difference	£ 2,032	
		Average	£ 107,833	
		APM	£ 98,020	
		Difference	£ 9,813	

Question by Jon Broome

17. It is commonly recognised that a high turnover of board members is an indication of poor governance and therefore an ‘amber flag’ for investing in an organisation. Over the last two years, there have been numerous board resignations : Mr Brian Wernham twice, Steve Wake, Simon Taylor and Steve Jones as well as the CEO deciding not to continue after 3 years. I also believe Ranjit Sidhu is intending to resign after one year on the board which brings the total to seven. Without going into individual cases, can the chair outline why he thinks there is such a high turnover of board members under his tenure compared with previous years?

Individuals’ reasons for not completing full appointment terms are varied and personal. The most commonly stated reasons are pressure of work, other commitments and personal matters. Boards can be challenging environments and not all trustees appreciate this when they apply. The Board has made it clear when seeking trustees that individuals do need to understand the serious nature of the role and the time commitment required.

Three years for a CEO is typical in today’s environment and the board was very pleased to be able to appoint the CEO’s replacement from an internal candidate.

Question by Jon Broome

18. For the year 2017/18, I believe for the first time in the APM’s history, we had a chair who was not an elected board member. At Branch & SIGs Forum in June 2018 at Brighton, he indicated that the board had decided that he should continue for another 3 years as chair as an unelected trustee. Can the board explain why they have done this?

The Board appointed John McGlynn as a trustee for a two (not three) year period from May 2018. He has also been appointed by the Board to be its Chair for the same period.

There is no constitutional or legal distinction between the roles and duties of trustees based on whether they are elected or appointed to the Board. Both routes to becoming a trustee are routine and normal. A Board will typically use its ability to directly appoint a trustee to deal with gaps in skills and experience or to aid with continuity and succession.

As part of the 2017 annual Board evaluation an external and independent consultant recommended that the Board adopt longer three-year appointment terms for its Chair. He considered that one-year terms are increasingly less common and that longer terms provide stability and continuity. In the event, the Board opted for a two-year term of office for the role of Board Chair. It decided that where a sitting trustee's current term of office would not be sufficient to allow for a longer term as Chair, that the Board should consider using one of the three appointed trustee positions to allow the desired term as Chair to be completed.

This is the situation which applied to John McGlynn who has stated he was delighted to be offered the opportunity to continue as trustee and Board Chair. John was elected as a trustee by the membership in November 2014 for a three-year term and elected chair in November 2016. The Board determined that it wished John to continue in his role as Chair. The Board must be free to choose who it wishes to be its Chair from amongst its number.

Question by Jon Broome

19. Can the board clarify whether John McGlynn has been appointed to the board under paragraph 16 (ii) or 16 (iii) of the Royal Charter.

Paragraph 16 (iii)

Question by Jon Broome

20. In a blog post of 11th July 2017, it stated in the current chair's profile "John is an avid supporter of APM's new strategy, Inspiring Positive Change, and aims to ensure he does all he can to represent members interests in achieving this." Given his desire to "represent members interests", can Mr McGlynn explain why he is seemingly unwilling to gain a democratic mandate to represent the members interests by putting himself up for election?

The response to question 18 above explains the background to the re-appointment of John McGlynn as a trustee.

Question by Jon Broome

21. This year the board introduced what I will refer to as 'the Mugabe clause' to the election process. Namely in the APM Regulations, Appendix 3 : Board Election Rules, Para 22, states: "the board may determine in its absolute discretion if an individual is a fit and proper person to serve as a trustee and whether it is appropriate and in the best interests of the Association for that individual to participate (or continue to participate) in the election process and/or stand as a candidate. ... The board's decision as to whether or not an individual is considered suitable to

be a trustee and/or stand as a candidate shall be final.” I am not precious about whether it is referred to as the Mugabe, Xi Jinping, Kim Jong-un or Putin clause, but could the board justify why they introduced this profoundly undemocratic clause.

The election rules were updated following lessons learned from 2017. These included the difficult decision the Board was required to take in deciding that one candidate was ineligible to participate in the election. The wording of the quoted rule merely reflects the pre-existing and continuing legal duty on trustees to act in the best interests of the charity. It is entirely appropriate for the Board to rule on an individual’s eligibility to participate in the Board elections. The Board considered that updating the rules makes the position and the Board’s responsibilities clear for all concerned. Other rules were updated, including setting out the standards expected of candidates in their canvassing.

The 2017 decision taken by the Board in determining that one candidate was ineligible to participate (and by extension the new election rule) was tested by an application for judicial review submitted against the Association. The application for permission was rejected robustly. A separate review by the Association’s external auditors also concluded that the Board had acted within its powers. Consequently, there should be no question over the legitimacy of the election rule and the characterisation of the clause as undemocratic is considered to be incorrect.

Question by Jon Broome

22. Has the above clause been used and, if so, without giving away any specifics on individuals, please state the reasons why.

Nominations were received from 25 candidates in the 2018 Board elections. Of these, 21 proceeded to the ballot.

- Two candidates decided to withdraw.
- One candidate was ruled ineligible to participate by the Company Secretary as they were not a full member, as required under the election rules.
- One candidate was ruled ineligible to participate by the Board following a detailed consideration of the position.

Question by Jon Broome

23. Up to the 2017 elections for trustees, the names of the candidates had always been announced in advance of the election opening. This is a demonstrable fact. I know of no other elections where this not the case and it seemingly goes against the principle of openness and transparency. Can the board explain why this change was made and, in particular, what makes APM so special that normal rules don’t apply?

The advice of ERS (who are world renowned experts in the field) was that it is most common in the elections they administer for candidate names to be released on the same day as voting opens. This is because people wish to vote once they see the candidate names and confusion and frustration follows when they are unable to do so. The statement that APM is not applying normal rules is therefore considered incorrect.

Candidate names were announced a little later than usual in 2017 due to the time needed for the Board to consider a candidate's eligibility and for the administrative steps thereafter to update hard copy voting packs. The timing was repeated in 2018. Partly to mitigate the above risk highlighted by ERS. But mostly as the process increased the number of online votes. This yields a cost saving.

Question by Jon Broome

24. Up to the 2018 elections, there was no rule banishing candidates from announcing and publicising their candidature prior to the official announcement by the APM (which in 2018 was the same date as the elections open – see previous question). I know of no other elections where this is the case and it seemingly goes against the principle of openness and transparency. Can the board explain why this change was made and, in particular, what makes APM so special that normal rules don't apply?

In 2017, a group of candidates released and promoted their candidacy in advance of the official publication of candidate details by the Association. The concern of the Association was that the early and partial release of names was unfair. It created an unlevel playing field as the candidates had given themselves an unfair advantage over the other nominees who had less time to canvass. This concern was borne out by the fact that two other candidates formally complained about this early canvassing.

The advice of ERS (who are world renowned experts in the field) was that the practice of APM in releasing names collectively created a level playing field and was a sound approach. This matter was tested as part of a judicial review application submitted against the Association. His Honour Judge Platts confirmed that the Association's approach was not unreasonable or unlawful in the context of administering a free and fair election. The statement that APM is not applying normal rules is therefore considered incorrect.

The introduction of the election rule is therefore to ensure that all candidates are fully aware of the timing and requirements around the release of names such that all participants have an equal and fair opportunity to participate.

APM
November 2018