



[peterjblundell@gmail.com](mailto:peterjblundell@gmail.com)

**Monday 21 September 2020**  
**Response to resolution submission**

Dear Peter,

Thank you for your resolution regarding the resolution voting criteria. Your resolution was carefully considered by the Board at its meeting on 11 September 2020. The Board agreed that this resolution was not in the best interests of BACP and would not be put forward to the members.

In April 2018 the Board resolved unanimously to amend the Standing Orders to increase the voting threshold to 5% of the membership for resolutions.

Prior to this, the threshold of support needed for a resolution was twenty-five members (proposer and seconder plus twenty-three other member signatures). At the time, twenty-five members equated less than 0.1% of BACP's membership. A threshold of 5% of eligible members aligns to the existing requirement within clause 3A of the Schedule of the Articles of BACP, which stipulates that 5% support from the membership is required for a general meeting to be called.

At the same meeting, the Board voted unanimously to introduce a motions process. Unlike resolutions, a member motion is not legally binding. Therefore, the advice provided to the Board was to set the threshold for support at 0.1% of the membership.

Whilst the 5% threshold has yet to be achieved, evidence suggests that this is achievable based on previous levels of member engagement in the overall voting process:

- In total, 5.1% of members voted for at least one resolution or motion in 2019
- Analytical data shows that 16.23% of members visited the voting site in 2019 - indicating that a significant portion of those members viewing the site chose not to support any resolution or motion
- In the same election year, the Board of Governor elections (an additional process which is linked to the AGM) received voter turnout of 7%

This engagement has been achieved via a proactive marketing campaign promoting the resolutions and voting process via a range of communication channels. In instances where members don't have email addresses information is sent via post.

From a public protection perspective, the PSA recently reviewed this point as part of the Annual renewal of accreditation 2019/20. They concluded:

*5.4 The Authority expects accredited registers to be managed in the public interest. It considers that there is a danger that, where the arrangements of an organisation can be affected by a vote of its membership, the members' interests may overcome the public interest. It can, however, address this by considering whether such changes suggest that the body should no longer be accredited. It considered that the 5% minimum threshold did not appear out of line with good practice in the charitable sector and considered that such a requirement was more rather than less likely to inspire confidence in the capacity of the BACP to manage the register effectively.*

Based on the above, we have confidence that the threshold levels set, regarding legally binding resolutions, is both achievable and appropriate.

We'd like to thank you for engaging with this process.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'N Bailey', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Natalie Bailey  
BACP Chair