



## **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST**

**FOI Reference number: 39/2013**

**Date: 12 August 2013**

**Request:**

**APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT MEMBERS TO NORTH DOWN PCSP**

Request for information on each candidate considered for appointment by the Policing Board for Northern Ireland (PBNI) panel in Round 1 and Round 2. Also requested is general information on the appointment process.

**Answer:**

The information requested is attached in 3 separate spreadsheets.

If you have queries about this request or the decision please contact the Board quoting the reference number above. If you are unhappy with the service you have received and wish to make a complaint or request a review you should write to the Board's Chief Executive at the following address:

Northern Ireland Policing Board  
Waterside Tower  
31 Clarendon Road  
Clarendon Dock  
Belfast BT1 3BG

Email: [foi@nipolicingboard.org.uk](mailto:foi@nipolicingboard.org.uk)

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner. Generally, the Information Commissioner's Office cannot investigate or make a decision on a case unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Board. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:-

The Information Commissioner's Office – Northern Ireland  
3rd Floor  
12 Cromac Place  
Gasworks  
Ormeau Road  
Belfast  
BT7 2JB.

Telephone: - 02890 269 380  
Email: - [ni@ico.org.uk](mailto:ni@ico.org.uk)

Please be advised that all Policing Board replies under Freedom of Information will be released into the public domain via our website @ [www.nipolicingboard.org.uk](http://www.nipolicingboard.org.uk).

Personal details in respect of your request have, where applicable, been removed to protect confidentiality.

## Form 1

Candidate code letter (for reference only)	NIPB Panel Marking Frame	Council Panel agreed composite score	NIPB Panel agreed composite score**	Community Background	Appointed in Round 1?
Applicant - named redacted	N/A	37	N/A	Protestant	No
A	N/A	36	N/A	Protestant	Yes
B	N/A	41	N/A	Protestant	Yes
C	N/A	31	N/A	Protestant	No
D	N/A	38	N/A	None / Other	Yes
E	N/A	35	N/A	Protestant	Yes
F	N/A	34	N/A	Protestant	Yes
G	N/A	37	N/A	Protestant	No
H	N/A	34	N/A	Protestant	Yes
I	N/A	33	N/A	Protestant	No
J	N/A	30	N/A	None / Other	No
K	N/A	35	N/A	Protestant	No
L	N/A	36	N/A	Protestant	No
M	N/A	31	N/A	Protestant	No
N	N/A	34	N/A	Protestant	No

## Form 2

Candidate code letter (for reference only)	Agreed NIPB Panel marking frame	Council Panel agreed composite score	NIPB Panel agreed composite score**	Community Background	Was candidate appointed at round 2?-	Was application considered by NIPB panel in round 1?	If so, did candidate submit new application in round 2?
Applicant - named redacted	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protestant	No	Yes	No
O	N/A	N/A	25	None / Other	No	No	N/A
P	N/A	N/A	28	Protestant	No	No	N/A
Q	N/A	N/A	30	Roman Catholic	Yes	No	N/A
R	N/A	N/A	28	Roman Catholic	No	No	N/A
S	N/A	N/A	30	Protestant	No	No	N/A
I	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protestant	No	Yes	No
L	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protestant	No	Yes	No
M	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protestant	No	Yes	No
K	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protestant	No	Yes	No
N	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protestant	Yes	Yes	No
G	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protestant	No	Yes	No
J	N/A	N/A	N/A	None / Other	No	Yes	No

Why were all the places not filled in round 1 of the process?	The appointment panel felt that it was not possible to achieve a representative PCSP based from the initial list of appointable candidates provided by North Down Borough Council
Was the essential criterion of community experience in North Down included in the advertising and / or information pack for applicants in round 2?	The criteria of community experience in North Down did not change for Rounds 1 and 2 and was included in both information packs
Did the NIPB panel have sight of Sect. 6 (Equal Opportunities) of each considered candidates application form prior to the Boards decision making?	Section 6 of the Application form was not provided to the Board appointment panels. Some Section 75 details were included in the anonymised forms provided to panel members on the day of the appointments for the purpose of fulfilling its statutory duty to make the PCSP representative
What if any was the pass mark for the NIPB phase of the process?	No score / marks were used by the appointment panel as all candidates from stage 1 were considered equally appointable
If marking frames were not used for the NIPB phase, how did the NIPB ensure that appointments were made solely on merit?	The appointment of Independent members to PCSPs follows a public appointment process and is conducted in two stages. The first stage, up to and including interview by the council, is based solely on merit and is conducted to the same standard as when someone is applying for employment. The second stage of the process undertaken by the Board's Appointment Panel is based on the Board's statutory duty to achieve a PCSP that is representative of the District. The Board Appointment Panel has the discretion to use its own judgement when making appointments.
In making the appointments what community mix was the Board seeking to achieve?	NISRA statisticians provided figures based on the 2001 Census which gave a suggested demographic composition which would make the PCSP representative. The panel used this as a guide when making the appointments. The figures used were as follows: Community Representativeness - In the first round 2 Roman Catholics and 6 Protestants. In the second round one Roman Catholic and one Protestant. For Gender, in the first round three males and 5 females. In the second round one male and one female. For Age in the first round one between the age group 18-25, two between the age group 26-40, 5 between the age group 41-60 and none between the age group 61+. In the second round one between the age group 18-25, one between the age group 26-40, none between the age group 41-60 and none between the age group 61+.
Impartial Assessor's comments on [REDACTED]	The Impartial Assessor did not provide the Board with comments on individual candidates
How did the publicity for round 2 differ from that for round 1?	In round two of the process the Board placed adverts in the local press in the North Down area
Which North Down organisations were targeted as required by Section 33 of the DoJ Code of Practice?	The Board held an information event in Ards Town Hall. A number of community groups were represented.