Public business

Statutory committee appointments: second and final report of the Task & Finish Group

Purpose
This paper, which is submitted by the Statutory Committee Appointments Task & Finish Group ("the Group"), makes recommendations concerning the induction, training, performance monitoring & improvement, discipline and removal of statutory committee members. It also considers how future arrangements can model good practice in equality and inclusion and looks at the scope and case for working with other regulators.

Recommendations

The Group recommends that the Council agree the following recommendations:

i. that the enhancements to the current induction and training process for statutory committee panellists described in 2.3-2.7 below be taken forward;

ii. that the GPhC’s interim methodology for performance appraisal of statutory committee panellists described at 3.3-4 below be approved for continued use, subject to review in 2 years’ time;

iii. that a similar process and forms (without the hearing feedback forms component) be used for the Appointments Committee (AC) chair and members;

iv. that the AC be tasked with reviewing the procedure for suspension and removal of statutory committee panellists, with a view to producing a revised draft for the Council’s approval by September 2011;

v. that the Rules be amended to remove the requirement for AC to develop statutory committee panellist competencies, and that the executive, in consultation with the AC, be tasked with developing these competencies for the Council’s approval;
vi. that the current statutory committee panellist competencies be simplified at their next iteration;

vii. that the staff should actively pursue discussions with other health professional regulators, to determine the realistic potential for joint working in relation to the appointment and management of statutory committee panellists, to inform future Council consideration; and

viii. that the suggestions for review and/or adoption of best practice measures in relation to equality and diversity at 7.6 below be taken forward.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Group has now considered all the matters listed in its terms of reference. In its interim report to Council in January 2010, the Group made recommendations, and Council agreed them, “subject to any further detailed considerations that may arise from the Group’s remaining work”. This work has now been completed, and the Group does not wish to recommend any modifications of its earlier recommendations. In particular, it had no changes to propose to the current composition of the AC following its conversation with the AC Chair, nor to its previous recommendations on AC chair and members’ terms of office (see Appendix A).

1.2 In the course of this second tranche of its work the Group considered one or two matters that were related to, but were not, strictly speaking, within its remit as set out by Council. It went on to make suggestions in these areas, which include provision for the future quality assurance of legal and clinical advisers, and the competencies for the chair and members of the Appointments Committee. These suggestions have been passed to the lead staff concerned. Due to the limitations of space these have not been included in this paper but the Group or secretariat will be happy to outline them if required.

2.0 Induction and training

2.1 All statutory committee panellists, both the 2010 intake and those carried over from the RPSGB, have now received training from Field Fisher Waterhouse solicitors and GPhC staff in the GPhC’s Rules and Procedures. All statutory committee panellists will receive Equality & Diversity (E&D) training over the next two to three months and the chairs and deputy chairs will have appraisal training before Easter. In addition, all panellists will attend an annual update training day.

2.2 The training programmes used most recently attempted to fit a great deal of information into one day’s induction. This reflected the need to bring those attending up to date on recent changes including legislation and procedures, with some important and complex subjects such as Interim Orders being covered in a
short period of time, and others (for example, some “softer” skills) not being covered at all.

2.3 While cost is, rightly, a key consideration, the Group recognises that to meet requirements for effective training more time will need to be allotted to statutory committee panellist training in future. The following enhancements to the current induction programmes are therefore proposed:

- Allow at least two days for induction training of FtP and Appeals Committee panellists, instead of the current one (Investigating Committee panellists do not sit on hearings and so may need less in the way of soft skills training).
- New statutory committee panellists and AC members should sit through a hearing before starting work (making three day’s induction in all).
- GPhC’s culture as well as its structure to be covered.
- Interim orders, the new case management directions and other items in more depth than the one-day programme allowed to be included.
- Time to be allowed for the development of soft skills e.g.:
  -- questioning
  -- active listening
  -- witness support
  -- case studies
  -- drafting determinations

2.4 Panellists for all three statutory committees, together with AC members, could benefit from, say, one day’s common induction training (which could include, for example, cultural training and context-setting re: pharmacy practice etc.), with the remaining training being committee-specific.

2.5 Further, it is proposed that in addition to the induction training all statutory committee panellists should attend one day’s training per year, to include updates in case law, procedure, GPhC policies, case studies and other items such as E&D as required. It was noted that care would need to be taken not to ‘over-fill’ the programmes, so as to allow for peer-to-peer experience sharing. In addition to this, chairs should attend a half-day session every six months. The office is also proposing to develop a regular bulletin to send to panellists to help keep them up to date with key developments.

2.6 It is suggested that statutory committee panellists should not be allowed to sit until they have completed induction training (although this should be monitored to ensure it does not lead to a shortage of available resource).

2.7 It is likely that panellist performance reviews (see section 3 below) will identify requirements for further specific training for certain panellists, which could be accommodated by bespoke training for small groups.
3.0 Performance monitoring and appraisal

3.1 It was previously agreed that the appraisal process of Statutory Committee panellists should begin again in the New Year, once all who needed training had received it. Accordingly, the office held discussions with the Appointments Committee Chair and agreed an interim appraisal process so that it could expedite appraisals of statutory committee panellists now, in advance of the Group’s recommendations for the future.

3.2 Appraisal training and observation of chairs and deputies is under way. The AC Chairs and members are being appraised from March-May, statutory committee chair and deputy appraisals should be completed by July, carried-over panellists should be completed by September and new panellists between September and January 2012.

3.3 An explanation of the interim appraisal process can be found at Appendix B. To summarise, the process has three separate aspects: feedback forms; assessment forms; and the annual appraisal. Panellists will be given a housekeeping form to complete on the day of the hearing and another performance related form to complete afterwards. The Secretariat will also have a feedback form to complete. In addition, before Mrs Filkin appraises a chair she will observe a hearing at which she/he is presiding. The information from the feedback forms will be recorded in a database for each member. This information will be reviewed continuously to identify and deal with issues or developmental needs as they occur.

3.4 Once a year, prior to their annual appraisal, statutory committee panellists will be asked to complete a competency-based self assessment form at their next hearing and their fellow panellists at the hearing will be asked to complete a competency-based peer assessment form. The information gained throughout the year as well as the results from the assessment will be consolidated into a report, which will be used by the appraiser to inform the annual appraisal, at which an appraisal form will be completed.

3.5 The Group considered whether to recommend an externally hosted and managed online methodology. It took into account the Council’s recent decision on its own appraisal process, and also the experience of other health professional regulators, and decided against such an approach on the grounds of expense, administrative burden and difficulty of ensuring that the assessment related to actual performance.

3.6 The Group felt that the GPhC’s interim methodology described at 3.3-4 above was sensible and was reassured that it could be accommodated within existing budgets. In particular, it is designed to facilitate performance monitoring and
management throughout the year, rather than relying on a single annual appraisal to address any specific problems or issues.

3.7 The Group did, however, express concerns that the process had the potential to be overly bureaucratic, and felt it should be reviewed in two years’ time to assess for this. Methods of assessing the effectiveness of the process should be developed, including:

- checking whether development needs had been identified
- whether there had been a discernable difference in outcome measures such as a reduced number of successful appeals

3.8 It is also suggested that a similar process and forms (without the hearing feedback forms component) be used by the Chair of Council when appraising the Chair of Appointments Committee, and by the Chair of Appointments Committee when appraising the Committee members. The peer assessment forms could be completed by AC members in respect of both Chair and members. In addition, statutory committee panel Chairs could be asked to complete these forms for the AC Chair’s appraisal.

4.0 Discipline and removal

4.1 The GPhC’s rules in respect of suspension and removal of statutory committee panellists make it clear that the Appointments Committee has the responsibility for suspension or removal of panellists. They specify the reasons which would render a panellist liable to suspension and removal, and prescribe that the procedure for the suspension or removal of a panellist is to be drafted by the Appointments Committee and submitted to the Council for approval. Once approved, the Appointments Committee must set the procedure out in writing and give a copy to every panellist and reservist.

4.2 There was some discussion at Council in January about the desirability or otherwise of attempts at informal resolution before invoking formal procedures. On balance, Group members were in favour of the approach, while agreeing the necessity of having properly worked-up formal procedures in place as well, should informal initiatives fail, or, in certain circumstances, be inappropriate. At its meeting with Elizabeth Filkin after the January Council meeting, the Group conveyed the advice from Council that formal processes for suspension and removal needed to be in place. Mrs Filkin agreed, on the basis that the aim would be to resolve most issues before such processes needed to be invoked.

4.2 The RPSGB Appointments Group Panel Handbook, which has not yet been updated, contains three paragraphs of text that briefly outline a procedure for discipline and removal of statutory committee panellists. This text has not been approved by the GPhC Council. The Rules make it clear that the AC must draft a
suspension/removal procedure for Council’s approval. The Group therefore recommends that the Appointments Committee be tasked with reviewing the above procedure, with a view to producing a revised draft for the Council’s approval in time for the September 2011 meeting.

5.0 Competencies

5.1 Competencies for statutory committee panellists

GPhC rules currently provide that the Appointments Committee should advise the Council on competencies for statutory committee panellists, and that the Council should set the competencies.

5.2 These rules are currently being reviewed, and it has been suggested that the GPhC should seek to remove the specification that the Appointments Committee should advise the Council on this matter. The intention is to increase flexibility as to who develops the competencies, while still reserving the approval of competencies to the Council. The Group agrees with this suggestion. It further recommends that in practice (although this should not be specified in the Rules) the executive, in consultation with the AC, should develop draft proposals for statutory committee chair and panellist competencies, for the Council’s approval.

5.3 The Group feels the current statutory committee panellist competencies are too lengthy and detailed, and recommends they be simplified at their next iteration.

5.3 Competencies for the Appointments Committee

Written competencies currently exist for the members and Deputy Chair (but not the Chair) of the RPSGB Appointments Group (as it then was; the competencies have not been updated since). These have been reviewed by the Group, with advice from the GPhC Head of HR. The Group felt these competencies were serviceable for now, and could be used as the basis for the current round of AC member appraisal, although they would need to be tweaked and tidied for any future recruitment.

5.4 The Group further suggested that the competencies could be used for the AC Chair, subject to the addition of the phrase “Ability to assess and manage the performance of AC members and statutory committee panellists” and the inclusion of reference to leadership and troubleshooting.

---

1 The General Pharmaceutical Council (Statutory Committees and their Advisers Rules) Order of Council 2010
6.0 The scope and case for joint working with other health professional regulators

6.1 Scope
Council has agreed that reform of the GPhC’s adjudication process itself is outside the Task & Finish Group’s remit. This paper therefore does not examine the options for change in this area.

6.1.1 There is considerable scope to explore options for joint working, with a number of options offering different levels of feasibility, complexity and potential benefit. Some of these are touched on in the following, non-exhaustive list. The options range along a continuum, from simple information sharing through to formal arrangements with potentially significant governance and accountability implications.

6.1.2 Shared learning and policy development
Sharing of information and best practice across the regulators is already happening in many areas, and CHRE is planning to explore and generate shared information, metrics and learning across the regulators in a range of areas. Beyond this, shared policy development would be a possibility on a practical level although further consideration would be needed about the possible outcomes.

6.1.3 Training
This would seem to be one of the more obvious options. Much panellist training could be the same for all health professional regulator panellists. Shared training is a relatively uncontroversial proposal and should result in cost savings in the area of trainer fees, as well as increasing the feasibility of timely and comprehensive induction training when a regulator has only appointed one or two new panellists at a time. There appear to be few practical obstacles to making progress and staff at other regulators have expressed an interest in exploring this area.

6.1.4 Recruitment
There is a range of opportunities around recruitment. At the most basic, advertisement costs could be significantly reduced by taking one advertisement to advertise for panellists for two or more regulators, if the timing of recruitment campaigns were co-ordinated. The sharing need go no further than that, with applicants directed to different websites or contact numbers depending on which profession they were interested in.

6.1.5 However, the desirable competencies for panellists across the regulators should be similar (or, at least, should offer potential for harmonisation). It might be possible to share longlists of lay panellists with other bodies (which, by provision
of a common pathway and common application forms, might also make life easier for applicants).

6.1.6 **Appointing body**
A common theme amongst the smaller regulators in particular has been the labour-intensiveness and expense of panellist recruitment, together with awareness of the political desirability of moving to a more independent/arms'-length model of panellist recruitment and management than they currently have in place. The GMC is currently consulting on proposals for a new tribunal model for doctors; CHRE has suggested previously that other regulators could choose to use the GMC’s tribunal services in the future, and also that other regulators might choose to offer shared services across the sector.

6.1.7 A senior member of staff from one regulator has, in informal conversations, expressed interest in exploring the possibility of sharing the GPhC’s appointments mechanism. The likely administrative difficulties of any such move, however, would have to be carefully considered in advance.

6.1.8 **Inter-regulator pool**
Taking the idea further, a common pool of lay panellists and/or advisors/assessors across regulators could save work, perhaps lead to a better quality of adviser being available to all and even promote greater consistency of approach and outcomes in the handling of impairment issues which are not profession-specific. While the rules would differ, it has been suggested that this might not present too much of a problem in reality. Staff from other regulators have suggested this option in informal conversations.

6.2 **The case for joint working**
6.2.1 The Command Paper on health professional regulation has just been published. It calculates the current combined cost of health and social care regulation in the UK as being in excess of £200million p.a., and notes that “(2.5) The simplest means of reducing the costs of regulation would be to merge regulators into higher volume organisations”. It goes on, however to say: “(2.6) We recognise... the disruption and professional concern that centrally imposed consolidation can cause. As an alternative to further structural change, we will commission the CHRE to lead a sector wide review of the cost-efficiency and effectiveness of each regulator within the CHRE’s remit, with a view to identifying significant costs savings”, while following this up with the promise that “(2.7)... If the sector itself is unable to identify and secure significant cost reductions over the next three

---

2 http://www.gmc-uk.org/concerns/8576.asp#adj
years, and contain registration fees, then the Government will revisit the issue of consolidating the sector into a more cost-effective configuration”.

6.2.2 Without prejudging the outcomes of the commissioned CHRE cost-efficiency & effectiveness review, it is right that the GPhC should consider the options for joint working in a range of areas across the regulators, which might or might not include any or all of those discussed in section 1 above.

6.2.3 What is not in dispute is that the public, and registrants, rightly expect that statutory bodies such as the GPhC should have a continuing focus on efficiency, particularly in the current economic climate. If the GPhC and/or other regulators were to fail to deliver efficiencies, the White Paper makes it clear that Government will review the position of each regulatory body.

6.2.4 The Executive is actively considering a number of options in this regard and will be seeking Council’s endorsement for its strategy in exploring appropriate opportunities.

6.2.5 A positive feature of the preparatory work to inform the Task & Finish’s Group’s work has been the eagerness of staff at various levels in other health care regulators to explore the potential for joint working in a number of areas, including, but not limited to, those concerning statutory committee panellists, and a desire on their part to start informal, exploratory discussions at executive level, to assess areas of current and potential synergy and scope out what might and might not be feasible. It is likely that a significant number of the suggestions in section 1 above may turn out to be impracticable for a variety of reasons, but it would seem right to start an informal, no-obligation, confidential exploration of the opportunities, to inform future Council consideration as and when it proves necessary.

7.0 Equality and diversity considerations

7.1 The Group was asked “to consider how future arrangements can model good equality and inclusion practice and can deliver a membership for statutory committees which is notable for its diversity”. It has accordingly considered the current appointment committee practices relating to equality and diversity (E&D), together with the interim GPhC equality scheme agreed by Council, and has made recommendations below on the areas of practice that may benefit from review under the Equality Act 2010, our scheme and current best practice.

---

7.2 *The GPhC Equality Scheme*

GPhC statutory committee members have responsibilities under the race, gender and disability equality duties as outlined in the interim equality scheme. The draft E&D action plan will state that associates will receive specific relevant E&D training and are enabled to put the E&D scheme into practice.

7.3 *The GPhC Equality and Diversity and Equal Opportunities Policies*

GPhC statutory committee members are expected to act in accordance with the equality and diversity policy. The equal opportunity practices and policies must be strictly adhered to by all employees and associates, who must be aware of the implications of equal opportunities legislation when carrying out their duties.

7.4 *Analysis of recent statutory committee panel recruitment exercise*

During a recent recruitment exercise for chairs, deputies and members of the statutory committees, carried out by the Appointments Committee, equality data was obtained and analysed for both successful and non-successful applicants. However, there appears to be no data available for the Appointments Committee members, nor for either existing statutory committee members or any previous recruitment exercises. Excerpts from the E&D analysis of the recent recruitment round can be found at Appendix C (see also paper 04.11/C/10).

7.5 While recognising that the completion of diversity monitoring forms by applicants was voluntary (175 were received from 219 applicants), the Group was surprised and concerned to note the ethnicity data from the recent round of statutory committee panellist recruitment, the small number of registrant applicants over 55 years of age and the absence of any registrant applicant declaring a disability. It was noted that the new Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (ED&I) Leadership Group would consider how this work should be taken forward, and that the item would be on the ED&I Group’s first agenda.

7.6 *Areas for review/adoption of best practice measures*

The Group recommends the following:

7.6.1 *Training*

- There is a need to ensure that there is robust, on-going, updated and relevant training for committee members. The new Equality Act came into being on 1 October 2010 and all committee members should be updated on its requirements. In addition, committee members should receive training on the GPhC equality scheme and consider how its aims could be reflected in their working practices.

- It is positive to see that “equal treatment” is included within the competency levels but we have a duty to reinforce this and ensure that committee members
are trained in accordance with our equality scheme, are aware of our E&D Policy and adhere to any action plan commitments or impact assessment processes.

- Consider developing training workstreams to feed into the main year 1 work plan
- Committee members should be considered as a priority for training needs as there is a high risk associated with this associate group.

7.6.2 Recruitment
- Best practice dictates that efforts should be made to ensure that people of protected characteristics should be encouraged and enabled to apply for vacancies (the Group’s comments at 7.5 above are particularly relevant here).

- The application packs for committee members do not adequately reflect our commitment to E&D. Consider substituting the current equal opportunities statement for: ‘We welcome applications from everyone irrespective of ethnic origin but, as people from ethnic minority groups are under-represented in our workforce, we would especially welcome applications from these jobseekers. Appointment will be on merit alone’… and/or… ‘We welcome enquiries from everyone and value diversity in our workforce’.

- The E&D data analysis outcomes (see Appendix C) should be reviewed and monitored (again as part of an action plan) across protected characteristics.

- The E&D data may provide evidence to suggest that ‘positive action’ under the Equality Act may be taken – steps that can be taken as an employer to encourage people from groups with different needs or with a past track record of disadvantage or low participation to apply for jobs.

- Include the E&D policy within the panel handbook.

8.0 Communications implications

8.1 Any decisions will need to be communicated to those affected as soon as possible.

8.2 It is suggested that the views of those affected by the suggestions in this paper (e.g. chairs and members of the statutory committees and the Appointments Committee) should be sought, for example by asking for feedback on the initial implementation of the interim appraisal process, and on the content of any draft revision to disciplinary procedures.
9.0 Resource implications

9.1 Induction and training
Currently, statutory committee panelists are paid a flat fee of £223 per day for attending training, although panelist fees will be reviewed in April, and attendance fees for an external trainer should be in the region of £1,000 per day or lower. It seems unlikely that the one-off development costs for new aspects of the training would amount to more than a one-off fee of £1,000. The Director of Regulatory Services has confirmed that the proposals in 2.3-2.7 above can be delivered within existing budgets.

9.2 Equality & diversity considerations
The proposals at 7.6 above with regard to training of panelists in particular carry significant cost implications. However, these represent statutory obligations, and the costs can be contained within existing budgets.

9.3 Joint working
As discussed above, sharing certain aspects of our work with other regulators could lead to cost savings, which could potentially be significant (for example, if we decided to share the costs of recruitment advertisement with other regulators). This would obviously be an area that the executive would explore very carefully if the Council were to empower it to investigate this area further, weighing any potential cost savings against the likelihood of increased complexity, unclear accountability, administrative burden and any other negative factors.

10.0 Risk implications

10.1 The most obvious risk is a statutory one, which would arise if the GPhC were not to fulfill its duty to provide equality & diversity training for its statutory committee panellists. Beyond that, the enhancements proposed to the induction and training programme for statutory committee panellists should reduce the risk of our determinations being challenged by CHRE and overturned in the courts.

10.2 The reinstatement of a performance appraisal programme as proposed at 3.3-4 above should similarly mitigate against the risk of legal challenge to panels' decisions.

10.3 The Group believes that the resolution of performance management issues without having to resort to formal procedures can be desirable in some cases. Nonetheless, it suggests that the absence of a properly worked-up and approved procedure for discipline and removal of statutory committee panellists, to underpin the provisions of the Rules in this area, could expose the organisation
to the risk of potentially expensive and damaging disputes, should attempts at informal resolution fail.

10.4 As set out in 6.2.1 above, the Government has threatened the health professional regulation sector with consolidation if it is unable to identify and secure significant cost reductions over the next three years. Exploration of the feasibility of joint working to a greater or lesser degree is proposed with a view to mitigating against this risk.

Recommendations

The Group recommends that the Council agree the following recommendations:

i. That the enhancements to the current induction and training process for statutory committee panellists described in 2.3-2.7 above be taken forward;

ii. that the GPhC’s interim methodology for performance appraisal of statutory committee panellists described at 3.3-4 above be approved for continued use, subject to review in 2 years’ time;

iii. that a similar process and forms (without the hearing feedback forms component) be used for the Appointments Committee (AC) chair and members;

iv. that the AC be tasked with reviewing the procedure for suspension and removal of statutory committee panellists, with a view to producing a revised draft for the Council’s approval by September 2011;

v. That the Rules be amended to remove the requirement for AC to develop statutory committee panellist competencies, and that the Executive, in consultation with the AC, be tasked with developing these competencies for the Council’s approval;

vi. That the current statutory committee panellist competencies be simplified at their next iteration;

vii. that the staff should actively pursue discussions with other health professional regulators, to determine the realistic potential for joint working in relation to the appointment and management of statutory committee panellists, to inform future Council consideration; and

viii. That the suggestions for review and/or adoption of best practice measures in relation to equality and diversity at 7.6 above be taken forward.

Elaine Mulingani, Head of Private Office
General Pharmaceutical Council
elaine.mulingani@pharmacyregulation.org, tel. 020 3365 3504
24 March 2011
The Group’s recommendations from its January 2011 interim report to Council (01.11/C/02)

Excerpt of Council minutes January 2011

384  “The Council agreed, subject to any further detailed considerations that may arise from the Group’s remaining work, to retain the existing structure and nature of membership of the Appointments Committee (AC), subject to:

a. timely completion of satisfactory appraisal of all AC members, including the Chair;

b. reinstatement of training & appraisal of statutory committee members; and

c. reporting of AC activities every six months for the first year to the Council and then a review as to whether annual reporting is sufficient.”

The Task & Finish Group’s January 2011 interim report to Council (01.11/C/02) also contained the following:

“2.4(c) Terms of office
The Group... noted that the Committee’s current handbook specified a four year term of office with the possibility of one renewal subject to satisfactory completion of appraisal. All of the Appointments Committee members except one had already served their first four year term, and their service had at the end of that term (spring 2010) been extended by the GPhC on a transitional basis until “at least a year from the date of transfer”. The Group felt that, should Committee members be reappointed upon satisfactory completion of appraisal, the period from the end of the original term until September 2011 should be counted toward a second (or first, as appropriate) term of up to four years, but that reappointment should be staggered in the interests of continuity. Appraisal outcomes could inform the decision on the respective lengths of term remaining.”

“2.5 Appointment of members of the Appointments Committee
“The Group believed that members of the Appointments Committee should be appointed by a panel comprising up to 2 Council members (1 registrant, 1 lay, although there would be no preference if only one Council member were to be on the panel) plus the Chair of the Appointments Committee, an independent assessor and an HR professional.”

“2.6 Staff resource
The Group felt strongly that the Appointments Committee would need to have access to professional HR advice for e.g. help with appraisal.”
Appendix B
Interim panellist performance appraisal process: overview

Feedback Forms
You will be asked to complete a ‘housekeeping’ form during a hearing and a performance feedback form after a hearing

The 'housekeeping' form asks you to comment on the papers, the advisers advice, the support staff etc.

The performance feedback form asks you to comment on your own and your fellow member's performance. Try to think of specific examples of what worked well and perhaps what didn't work so well.

Comments will be saved anonymously to the respective member's appraisal database and reviewed periodically

Peer and Self-Assessment
Prior to your annual appraisal you will be invited to complete a self-assessment form at your next hearing

Your fellow committee members at the hearing will be invited to complete a peer assessment form.

Both the peer and self-assessment forms will be based on the competency frameworks outlined in the attached document

The feedback will be consolidated into a report with other feedback gained throughout the year

Appraisals
Each member of the committees will be appraised annually

Chairs and deputy chairs will be appraised by Elizabeth Filkin and will in turn appraise lay and registrant members of their respective committees

To share the work load of appraisals each member has been assigned to a chair or deputy chair

The same appraisal forms as previously used will be used during the appraisal

This system will provide the information required to –
- Increase the efficiency and effectiveness of hearings
- Identify ongoing training needs in order to plan a thorough annual training programme
- Enable cross learning between members by identifying effective behaviours and ways to improve
- Provide sufficient information to assist the annual appraisal process

This appraisal system relies heavily on your participation and we ask that you make the time to complete the feedback and assessment forms as honestly and thoroughly as you can.
Appendix C

Extracts from Equality & Diversity Analysis of the recent statutory committee panellist recruitment round

Applicants for Deputy Chair

**Ethnic Background**
- African: 3%
- White British: 6%
- Irish: 6%
- Chinese: 9%
- Indian: 3%
- Pakistani: 3%
- Ethnic Background: 73%

**Age**

- 41-45: 3%
- 46-50: 6%
- 51-55: 3%
- 56-60: 9%
- 61-65: 3%
- 66-70: 3%
- 71-75: 6%

**Gender**
- Female: 6%
- Male: 94%

**Disability**
- Yes: 6%
- No: 94%

Applicants for Deputy Chair and Lay Member

**Ethnic Background**
- White British: 3%
- Irish: 3%
- Bangladeshi: 3%
- Mixed: 3%
- African: 6%
- White other: 3%
- Ethnic Background: 82%

**Age**

- 41-45: 3%
- 46-50: 3%
- 51-55: 3%
- 56-60: 3%
- 61-65: 6%
- 66-70: 6%

**Gender**
- Female: 40%
- Male: 60%

**Disability**
- Yes: 6%
- No: 94%
Lay Member applicants

Ethnicity

- White British: 80%
- White other: 3%
- Irish: 3%
- Caribbean: 3%
- Pakistani: 3%
- Chinese: 3%
- Black British: 2%
- African: 1%

Gender

- Male: 52%
- Female: 48%

Age

- 3% in 31-40
- 5% in 41-45
- 10% in 46-50
- 15% in 51-55
- 20% in 56-60
- 4% in 61-65
- 4% in 66-70
- 3% in 71-75

Disability

- Yes: 3%
- No: 97%

Registrant Member Applicants

Ethnicity

- White British: 88%
- White Other: 8%
- Chinese: 4%

Gender

- Male: 65%
- Female: 35%

Age

- 0% in <30
- 5% in 31-40
- 10% in 41-45
- 15% in 46-50
- 20% in 51-55
- 20% in 56-60
- 10% in 61-65
- 0% in 66-70

Disability

- Yes: 0%
- No: 100%
**Investigating Committee Chair Applicants**

### Ethnicity
- Black Caribbean: 11%
- White Other (Jewish): 11%
- Mixed White and Asian: 11%
- White British: 56%
- White Irish: 11%

### Gender
- Male: 44%
- Female: 56%

### Age
- Age/years: 89%
- 36-40: 11%
- 41-45: 11%
- 46-50: 11%
- 51-55: 11%
- 56-60: 11%
- 61-65: 11%

### Disability
- No: 89%
- Yes: 11%