Impact Statement of Proposed AP Bylaw Revisions

Bylaw Title: Revision of APAC bylaws

Policy Sponsor: Appointed Professionals Advisory Council’s AP Policy Committee and AP Membership Committee, with the input of the Executive Committee

APAC membership initial review date: June, 2015

Policy Statement
The APAC bylaws are being revised to (a) make clearer the role APs play in supporting the priorities set out in the University’s Strategic Plan, *Never Settle*; (b) create more opportunities for AP participation in APAC; and (c) better align with current practice around the recruitment and welcome of new members.

Policy Reason
The policy revisions aim to expand the depth and breadth of Council expertise by seeking enhanced diversity of perspectives from our AP colleagues and creating greater opportunities for focused AP participation. The proposed revisions would increase the number of APAC membership seats available, and establish membership recruitment goals outside of strict organizational unit representation.

What will be the major impact of the policy?
The revisions will make our bylaws clearer with respect to number of members, since the data needed to support a membership model based on ‘maximum’ number of representatives, as well as the data to create opportunities for organizational representatives to connect with their ‘constituents,’ has been difficult to acquire and share. The revisions clarify the need for a diversity of AP representatives by aligning AP roles with *Never Settle* priorities, and elevate the importance of such representatives by type of work (i.e., student support, innovation and research, community partnering, financial stewardship) to a level equal to that of organizational unit representation. Finally, the revisions also make clearer expectations of members of APAC with respect to attendance and engagement in APAC meetings, committees, and shared governance input.

What concerns might be expressed by stakeholders?
Under the existing model, organizational units (meaning, administrative homes in which APs are housed, based on the UA org chart) were limited to a maximum number of representatives (1 for every 50 APs in the organizational unit.) Reversing from a maximum to an aspirational minimum introduces the possibility of bloc voting for officers, or informing APAC agendas in ways that do not serve a sufficiently diverse spectrum of APs. These concerns are mitigated by the fact that often AP roles are often as diverse within an organizational unit as they are between different organizational units.

Will there be a financial cost to implement?
No