

Northern Ireland Policing and Community Safety Partnerships

Appointment of Independent Members

**Report of the Impartial Assessor
To The Northern Ireland Policing Board**

Report Prepared by:

Gwen Savage

October 2015

Appointment of Independent Members

Report of Impartial Assessor

Contents:	Page	
1.0	General Introduction	2/4
2.0	Establishment of PCSPs and DPCSPs	4
2.4	Councils	5
2.5	Political Members	5
2.7	Independent Members	5
2.12	Designated Members	6
3.0	Equality of Opportunity and Representativeness	6
4.0	Guaranteed Interview Scheme (GIS)	6
5.0	Probity	6
6.0	Openness and Transparency	7
7.0	Independent Scrutiny	7
8.0	Disqualification	7
9.0	Confidentiality	8
10.0	Appointment of outside Human Resource Providers	8
10.5	Timescales	8
11.0	Appointment of Training Providers	9
12.0	Initial Overview	9
13.0	Monitoring the Process Stage by Stage	10
14.0	Planning the Process	12
14.4	Advertising / Publicity	12
14.9	Number of Applications	13
15.0	Training	14
16.0	Selection	15
16.1	Stage 1	15
16.2	Stage 2	16
16.6	Shortlisting	17
16.18	Interviewing	18
16.29	Checking Documentation	20
16.36	Council Panel Members	21
17.00	Stage 3	22
17.1	Appointment Panels	22
17.2	Appointments Process	22
18.0	Independent Complaints Monitor	23
19.0	Recruitment of Young People	23
20.0	Executive Summary	24
21.0	Recommendations	26

1.0 General Introduction

1.1 The Northern Ireland Policing Board carried out a public appointments process between February 2015 and August 2015 to appoint Independent Members to the Policing and Community Safety Partnerships. (PCSPs) and the District Policing and Community Safety Partnerships (DPCSPs).

1.2 The process was conducted according to the Code of Practice issued by the Department of Justice in March 2015. Codes of Practice issued in October 2014 and December 2014 were amended to reflect a significant change in the process to appoint Independent Members to the PCSPs and DPCSPs.

1.3 The significant change in the process involved the appointment by the Policing Board of outside Human Resource Providers. It had been expected that the Councils would undertake the responsibility for Stage 2 of the appointment of Independent Members to the PCSPs, but, after consultation with the Councils over a period of months, and, it has to be said, very late in the day, the Councils took the decision not to undertake this task. The reason given was the heavy workload involved in the Reform of Public administration (RPA).

1.4 The Councils' decision resulted in considerable delay in the commencement of the recruitment process.

Code of Practice

1.5 The Code of Practice March 2015 gives guidance to the Northern Ireland Policing Board (NIPB), the District Councils and any others involved in the recruitment of Independent Members to the PCSPs, on their respective roles in the nomination and appointment of Independent Members to PCSPs and DPCSPs.

1.6 The Code is issued under paragraph 6(2) of Schedule 1 and paragraph 6(2) of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act Northern Ireland 2011.

1.7 The provisions under the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 enable the Department of Justice to issue and from time to time revise a code of practice containing guidance as to the exercise by councils and the Policing Board of their functions in the nomination and appointments process for Independent Members.

1.8 The provisions governing the operation and functions of PCSPs and DPCSPs are set out in Part 3 of the Justice Act and Schedules 1 and 2. These provisions set out how PCSPs and DPCSPs are to be established – how appointments of political and independent members and designated organisations are to be made – the constitution of the partnerships – arrangement for oversight by the Joint Committee and how the positions of chairperson and vice-chair are to be filled. They also provide a statutory basis for the production of the code

1.9 Under paragraph 6(1) of Schedule 1 and paragraph 6(1) of Schedule 2, District Councils and the Policing Board must have regard, in carrying out their functions, to this code and the relevant parts of the Justice Act.

Consultation

1.10 In line with paragraph 6 of Schedule 1 and paragraph 6 of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act, the Department of Justice (DoJ) has consulted Councils, the Policing Board and the Equality commission on the code, prior to issue.

1.11 Although these appointments do not come within the remit of the Commissioner for Public Appointments, they are made using a process which follows the Commissioner's Code of Practice.

Availability of the Code

1.12 The Code of Practice was made available to the Policing Board, District Councils, councillors, council staff, training providers and HR providers appointed by the Policing Board, independent panel members, the impartial assessors and all those involved in the selection and appointment of independent members. It was also available, on request, to those wishing to apply for membership of PCSPs and DPCSPs.

2 Establishment of PCSPs and DPCSPs

2.1 Section 20 of the Justice Act provides that each District Council shall establish for its district, a Policing and Community Safety Partnership. It also provides that the District Council for Belfast shall establish, for each police district established under section 20 (2) of the Police (Northern Ireland) Act 2000, a body to be known as a District Policing and Community Safety Partnership (DPCSP) These have been established to reflect the four areas of North, South, East and west within the Belfast City Policing district. The Act does not permit the establishment of DPCSPs outside Belfast.

2.2 PCSPs were established under the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 to help keep communities safer. The functions of PCSPs and DPCSPs are set out at paragraphs 21(1) and 22(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011. Included in these functions is the requirement to make arrangements for obtaining the co-operation of the public with the police in preventing crime and enhancing community safety in the police district.

2.3 Following the reorganisation of local government, the 26 councils were reduced to 11 councils in 2015. There is therefore a requirement for 11 PCSPs and 4 DPCSPs – one for each police area in Belfast City Council District i.e. North, South, East and West Belfast.

Councils – PCSPs and DPCSPs

2.4 The new constituted PCSP areas are:

- * Antrim and Newtownabbey
- * Armagh, Banbridge and Craigavon
- * Belfast
- * Causeway Coast and Glens
- * Derry City and Strabane
- * Fermanagh and Omagh
- * Lisburn and Castlereagh
- * Mid and East Antrim
- * Mid Ulster
- * North Down and Ards
- * Newry, Mourne and Down

Political Members

2.5 By virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 1 to the Justice Act, a PCSP shall consist of 8,9 or10 political members as the council may determine. By virtue of paragraph 2 of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act a DPCSP shall consist of 6 political members.

2.6 In appointing political members, the Council shall ensure, so far as is practicable, that the political members of PCSPs and DPCSPs reflect the balance of parties on the council immediately after the local election.

Independent members

2.7 Paragraph 4 of Schedule 1 to the Justice Act states that the number of independent members of the PCSPs and DPCSPs shall be one less than the number of political members.

2.8 Appointments shall be made by the Policing Board from among persons nominated by the council and shall, as far as is practicable, secure that political and independent members of PCSPs and DPCSPs (taken together) are representative of the community in the district.

2.9 Independent members of both PCSPs and DPCSPs are appointed by the Policing Board who have overall responsibility for the recruitment process, from nominations made by the council. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Schedule 1 and paragraphs 4 and 5 of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act refer to independent members' appointments to PCSPs and DPCSPs respectively.

2.10 In making these appointments, the Policing Board is required to seek, as far as is practicable, to ensure that the overall membership of each PCSP is representative of the community in the Council area. Within Belfast, the Policing Board must seek, as far as is practicable, to ensure that the membership is representative of the community of Belfast as a whole and that membership of each DPCSP is representative of that district. It is possible for candidates to be appointed to both Belfast PCSP and a DPCSP.

2.11 The Determined size of Partnerships for PCSPs and DPCSPs is made up of 133 Political Member posts and 118 Independent Member posts. **Details at Appendix 1**

Designated Members

2.12 In addition, by virtue of paragraph 7 of Schedules 1 and 2 of the Justice Act, each PCSP and DPCSP must designate at least 4 organisations that will be required to provide representation on that PCSP and DPCSP and include any organisations designated by the Department of Justice through order. Designated members will have the same status as political and independent members.

3 Equality of opportunity and representativeness

3.1 The Policing Board and councils are governed by statutory duties relating to the equality of opportunity and representativeness, they are required by section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 to ensure that all candidates have equality of opportunity to apply and to be considered for appointment, irrespective of age, disability, gender, marital status, sexual orientation, racial group, community background, political opinion or because a person has or has not dependants.

3.2 The Policing Board is also required, under paragraph 4 (3) of Schedule 1 and paragraph 4 (2) to the Justice Act, to secure, as far as is practicable, that the members of the PCSPs and DPCSPs are representative of the community in that area.

3.3 Both of these duties make it important to ensure that the widest possible range of candidates is encouraged to apply and that equality of opportunity is promoted between section 75 groups.

4 Guaranteed Interview Scheme (GIS)

4.1 For the 2015 recruitment of independent members to PCSPs and DPCSPs, the Policing Board introduced the Guaranteed Interview Scheme (GIS).

4.2 This scheme guaranteed to interview anyone with a disability whose application met the minimum criteria. Minimum criteria meant that the candidate must provide evidence in his/her application form which demonstrated that he/she generally met the level of competence required for each criteria, as well as meeting any of the skills and experience defined as essential.

5 Probity

5.1 Adherence to high standards of probity and propriety in the appointments process ensures public confidence in it. Those involved in making the appointments should endeavour to ensure that appointees are committed to, and capable of, carrying out their duties in line with the principles and values of public service, as defined by the first report of the House of Commons Committee on Standards in Public Life. These are: selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership.

6 Openness and Transparency

6.1 The appointments process must be open and transparent in order to encourage public confidence in the procedures that support the final selection.

7 Independent Scrutiny

7.1 The Code of Practice issued in March 2015 by the Department of Justice (DoJ) states at paragraph 3.5 that the process must involve independent scrutiny at every stage of the recruitment process. There were three layers of scrutiny:

- * Independent Panel Members (IPMs) appointed by the Policing Board for each of the shortlisting and interview panels and appointment panels. The IPMs were taken from the Commissioner for Public Appointments' (CPANI) list of approved and trained independent assessors. IPMs have full voting rights.

- * Impartial assessor appointed by the Policing Board at the commencement of the planning process. The Impartial Assessor to oversee all aspects of the process. The role of the Impartial Assessor is to assess the process for openness, transparency, probity and effectiveness, to ensure compliance with the Code and to provide a report for the Policing Board at the conclusion of the process.

- * Independent Complaints Monitor (ICM) appointed by the Policing Board. The Independent Complaints Monitor will investigate complaints from candidates.

8 Disqualification

8.1 By virtue of paragraph 9(1) of Schedule 1 and paragraph 9(1) of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act, a person is disqualified from being an independent member of a PCSP or DPCSP if he/she is:

- * a police officer
- * a member of the police support staff
- * a member of the Policing Board
- * a local Government councillor
- * an employee of the Council to which they are applying

8.2 In addition, under paragraph 9(3) of those Schedules, individuals are disqualified if they have, within the past 5 years, served or been discharged from a sentence of imprisonment or detention. Suspended sentences do not count for the disqualification, unless they have been ordered to take effect. Former prisoners need to have been out of prison for five years before they can be considered for membership of a PCSP or DPCSP.

9 Confidentiality

9.1 The Code of Practice at paragraph 3.1 states that the Policing Board, councils, councillors, independent panel members, the impartial assessor, independent complaints monitor and anyone else involved in the process to nominate and appoint independent members to a PCSP or DPCSP should respect the confidentiality of personal information, unless a candidate has given permission for its release and must sign a confidentiality agreement.

10 Appointment of outside Human Resource (HR) providers

10.1 The selection, on merit, of candidates to be nominated as suitable for appointment as independent members of PCSPs and DPCSPs, is the responsibility of councils (paragraph 3.15 of the Code of Practice). The Policing Board expected the councils to undertake this responsibility. However, after months of negotiation, the Local Reform Working Group advised the Policing Board in November 2014 that they were not in a position to undertake this task, due to the workload involved in the reorganisation of local government (RPA).

10.2 This was disappointing, as the council HR officers provided a very valuable and competent service during the 2012 recruitment process. Their involvement included providing advice and guidance to interview panels, the completion of the necessary paperwork for shortlisting and interviews and corresponding with candidates. It would, therefore, have been very important to harness this experience for the 2015 recruitment.

10.3 As a result of the councils' decision, the Policing Board engaged with CPD to procure the services of an outside provider of HR services, to carry out Stage 2 of the recruitment process.

10.4 Tenders were received from two HR providers and, after evaluation of the tenders, an outside provider was appointed in February 2015.

Timescales

10.5 The immediate issue following the councils' decision was the impact on timescales. Closing date for receipt of applications was 28 November 2014 and the recruitment process was expected to be completed by the beginning of April 2015, with appointments being made by the end of May 2015.

10.6 The functions of the HR providers were – to provide all administrative tasks – consult with council officials to arrange shortlisting and interview dates and venues for 11 council areas – provide professional advice and guidance to panel members at shortlisting and interview stages – liaise with candidates before, during and after the recruitment process. This had to be done within very tight timescales.

10.7 Stage 2 of the recruitment process to appoint independent members to the Policing and Community Safety Partnerships and the District Policing and Community Safety Partnerships, due to commence December 2014 did not commence until March 2015.

11 Appointment of Training Providers

11.1 Paragraph 3.46 of the Code of Practice states that the Policing Board should ensure that training is provided, by experienced trainers, to all those involved in shortlisting / interviewing. Only panel members who have attended training sessions should sit on panels. Specific training should be provided for Chairs of the shortlisting and interviewing panels.

11.2 The Policing Board invited tenders for the provision of training to panel members to assist with the selection of candidates for appointment of independent members to the PCSPs and DPCSPs.

11.3 Several tenders were received and, after evaluation, the successful tenderer was appointed in November 2014. Training commenced in December 2014.

12 Initial Overview

12.1 This report will consider, stage by stage, the process for the appointment of **118** Independent Members to Northern Ireland's PCSPs and 4 Belfast DPCSPs. It will identify issues that have arisen in the process and will make recommendations (if any) for improvement in future competitions.

12.2 As the Impartial assessor, it was important that I acted, through the whole process, in a manner that was separate, independent, impartial and objective and adhered to the requirements of the Code of Practice, issued by the Department of Justice (DoJ) in March 2015.

12.3 The Policing Board retain overall responsibility for the process to appoint Independent Members to PCSPs and DPCSPs. However, **Councils have responsibility for Stage 2 of the process.** This involves the selection and nomination of candidates solely on merit and is designed to identify those candidates who are deemed suitable to be considered for appointment.

12.4 Stage 1 of the process, undertaken by the Policing Board is an eligibility sift to identify those who are disqualified by virtue of paragraph 9(1) of Schedule 11 and paragraph 9(1) of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act. **There were no candidates sifted out at this stage.**

12.5 Stage 3, governed by legislation and by the Code of Practice, requires the Policing Board, in appointing from among the persons nominated by the Councils to, as far as is practicable, secure that the membership of each PCSP and DPCSP (both political and independent members taken together) is representative of the community in the council area, or in the case of DPCSP, the area covered by that District Partnership.

12.6 As referred to earlier in this report, the Councils, after some months of negotiation with the Policing Board, took the decision that, due to the Reform of Public administration (RPA), their workload was too heavy to enable them to undertake Stage2 of the process. This was a last minute decision and left the Policing Board in the difficult position of having to recruit an outside Human Resource Provider.

12.7 The Policing Board had to go through the lengthy procurement process with the result that the outside Human Resource Provider was not appointed until late February 2015. **Given the very tight timescales, credit must be given to the Policing Board and the HR provider for the speed in which they were able to commence the process.** The majority of shortlisting meetings were scheduled for March with some interviews commencing before the end of March. This was no mean achievement, as councillors' diaries were very busy in the run up to the 1 April deadline for the new super councils so the availability of panel members was very restricted.

13 Monitoring the process stage by stage

13.1 Introduction

13.2 I was appointed as Impartial Assessor in September 2014. My first task was to scrutinise all documentation to be used in the recruitment process, including the advertising of the appointment of Independent Members to PCSPs and DPCSPs.

13.3 The Policing Board officers had taken on board recommendations from the Impartial Assessor's report, following the 2012 competition and had modified the application form to make it more 'user friendly'. Essential and desirable criteria were replaced by three Eligible criteria, making completion of the application form more straightforward.

13.4 A very useful and informative Information Booklet was produced by Policing Board officers to assist in the completion of the application form. Policing Board officers were available by telephone to answer queries from potential applicants.

13.5 However, in spite of all the assistance available, some applications were very light in information, making it difficult for panel members at shortlisting stage to assess the applicant's experience and competence. It is difficult to know what more can be done in this regard, as the Information Booklet sets out very clearly the experience and competencies required and the importance of demonstrating, by way of examples how the criteria should be met.

13.6 There was regular interaction during the process between the Policing Board officers and myself and, when the HR provider was appointed, weekly 3 way conference calls were established to keep everyone up-to-date with progress and to resolve any queries.

13.7 As in previous PCSP recruitment processes, as 'Impartial assessor's Progress File' was established to record all meetings with relevant personnel, records of the checking process, together with background documents. This file will be deposited with the Policing Board officer for use as a reference source and to inform any future monitoring processes.

13.8 The Impartial Assessor's remit is very comprehensive. It included the following tasks, which give a flavour of the Impartial Assessor's work:

- * Scrutinising all documentation
- * Attending Information Evenings designed to encourage applicants
- * Regular meetings with Policing Board Officers
- * Attending meetings with Training providers and training sessions
- * Attending meetings with HR providers
- * Checking Stage 1 Sifting process
- * Attending shortlisting and interviewing panels in 11 council areas
- * Monitoring the process for feedback to candidates
- * Attending training for appointment panel members
- * Observing at appointment panels
- * Checking paperwork of HR provider to ensure accuracy of information
- * Examining the results of the Appointment process
- * Preparation and presentation of this report to the Policing Board

13.9 The Impartial Assessor's report is intended to provide the Policing Board, the District Councils, the general public, the Department of Justice, relevant Government Departments and other interested parties, with a wholly independent account of the process by which Independent Members are appointed to PCSPs and DPCSPs.

13.10 The report will express the view of the Impartial Assessor on the compliance of the nomination and appointments process with the Code of Practice and will assist those with responsibility for the planning and implementation of the process to identify opportunities to refine and improve the process for future competitions.

13.11 The Impartial Assessor's role is to ensure that independent members of the PCSPs and DPCSPs are appointed through a process of openness, transparency, probity and effectiveness, to ensure compliance with Code and to provide a report at the conclusion of this process.

13.12 I wish to put on record my thanks to the Policing Board officers for their co-operation and timely responses to any requests for meetings and information.

14 Planning the process

14.1 As with previous recruitment rounds, the process was a large and complex one, requiring a fair and consistent methodology for appointing 119 independent members to 11 PCSPs and 4 DPCSPs, using different shortlisting / interviewing panels in every District and processing over 400 applications.

14.2 The Policing Board produced an 'Indicative Timetable for the appointment of Independent members to the Policing and Community Safety Partnerships (PCSPs) and District Policing and Community Safety Partnerships (DPCSPs). This was approved by the Board. Due to delays in the commencement of the process an amended timetable was produced.

14.3 From the indicative timetable, the detailed plans for each stage were developed and agreed.

Advertising/ Publicity

14.4 The Policing Board is responsible for the publicity and awareness raising to support the appointment of independent members to PCSPs and DPCSPs. The DoJ Code of Practice for the Appointment of Independent Members to PCSPs and DPCSPs at paragraph 3.35 and paragraph 3.36 provides guidance to the Policing Board on publicity.

14.5 The key aim was to achieve the widest possible coverage and awareness to ensure that communities are informed about the appointment process and how people can apply to become an independent member of their PCSP.

14.6 An advertisement was placed in 4 of the main daily newspapers.

14.7 Information evenings were held at the following areas:

- * Irvinestown, Enniskillen
- * Bangor
- * Coleraine
- * Cookstown
- * Belfast

As the Impartial Assessor I attended the Belfast evening. A member of the Policing Board attended along with Policing Board officers. It was well attended and very informative. Questions from the audience were very competently addressed by the Policing Board member and Policing Board officers.

14.8 Other forms of publicity and awareness included an in-house video produced by the Communications Branch which was uploaded onto the Board's You Tube channel, press releases, media coverage. Both the Board and PCSP's Facebook pages and Twitter accounts were used extensively. Several of the PCSP Managers set up Facebook pages. Information was given to Designated Bodies, Youth Advisory Panel, NICS internal website, Churches, Voluntary/Community groups, Universities and the Business community. Several Councils published the advertisement on their websites. .

14.9 The total number of applications for up to 119 PCSP Independent Member positions totalled 414. It was hoped that the campaign would attract at least 3 times the positions available (357). The final number of applications showed that the target had been exceeded. The Communications branch took on board the recommendations in the 2012 Impartial Assessor's report and reached out to the communities in a very positive and well targeted campaign.

14.10 A breakdown of the applications received across the 11 new District Councils:

*	Antrim and Newtownabbey	35
*	Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon	45
*	Belfast	81
*	Causeway Coast and Glens	38
*	Derry City and Strabane	25
*	Fermanagh and Omagh	36
*	Lisburn and Castlereagh	21
*	Mid and East Antrim	24
*	Mid Ulster	34
*	Newry and Mourne and Down	29
*	North Down and Ards	46
	Total completed forms	414
	Hard copy applications	27
	Electronic applications	387

Copy of advertisement

Appendix 2

Details of media coverage

Appendix 3

14.11 Two Councils – Antrim and Newtownabbey and Lisburn and Castlereagh failed to attract sufficient applications to enable the Policing Board to make appointments that would reflect the communities. Re-advertisements were placed in local media resulting in a further 24 applications for Antrim and Newtownabbey and 21 applications for Lisburn and Castlereagh.

15 Training

15.1 The Policing Board appointed outside trainers in November 2014 following a tendering process. Training on interview skills commenced on 1 December 2014. All panel members were advised that they could not partake in the process if they had not attended the training.

15.2 The training providers were well prepared and delivered very structured and informative training sessions. They were well prepared, having read the Code Of Practice and the Impartial Assessor's 2012 report.

15.3 The training included note taking, scoring, interview skills, using role play and references to the Code where appropriate. There was no evidence to suggest that any of the panel members had read the Code of Practice so it would be important to ensure that panel members had some knowledge of the Code before training commenced. Policing Board officers attended the training sessions and answered any queries, therefore no panel member should have been in any doubt of the requirements of the Code, but having read it beforehand would have been helpful. This will be a recommendation.

15.4 A day was set aside for specific training for chairs, as recommended in the 2012 report. This was well received and should have prepared the chairs for their important role. Emphasis was placed on the Chairperson's introduction and closing statements.

15.5 Feedback from participants indicated that most had found the training very helpful. Some councillors, who had been through the training for previous PCSP competitions felt that they had not benefitted greatly as they had 'heard it all before'. However, I feel that all panel members should attend the training sessions no matter how experienced they are. There is always something new to learn.

15.6 Training on shortlisting was not included and during the shortlisting days some of the panel members clearly could have benefitted from some training in this area. It will be important to include this when training for the next PCSP recruitment.

15.7 The training providers used the documents in the Core Process Manual during the training to ensure that panel members were familiar with the forms and the process. However, because the HR provider did not use the documents in the Core Process Manual some panel members found it confusing when faced with different forms to complete. The HR provider provided assistance where necessary. It will be important that the training provider and HR provider use the same documentation in future competitions.

15.7 Training was completed by the end of December. Unfortunately, due to the delay in commencement of the recruitment process, some panel members advised that they had forgotten most of what they had learned. However, the HR providers were more than capable of ensuring that panel members completed all the documentation correctly and no candidate was disadvantaged in any way.

Recommendations:

- * training on shortlisting processes should be included
- * Code of Practice should be issued to all panel members
- * all panel members should attend training regardless of previous experience
- * training should be aligned to the commencement of the recruitment process
- * training provider and HR provider should use the same documentation

16 Selection

Stage 1

16.1 The Policing Board is responsible for Stage 1 of the process. Each of the 414 applications was given a unique reference number. The initial sift of applications was carried out to establish eligibility. The Policing Board ensured that a candidate was not disqualified under the provisions of Paragraph 9 of Schedule 1 or paragraph 9 of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011. Under this legislation a person is disqualified for being a political or Independent member of a PCSP or DPCSP if that person is:

- * a police officer
 - * a member of the police support staff
 - * a member of the Policing Board
 - * an employee of the council responsible for the
- PCSP
- * if they will not sign a declaration against terrorism
 - * if they have in the last 5 years served all or any
- part of a prison or or detention
- * detention sentence or been released from a prison
- remission
- * sentence on license or in pursuance of a grant of
 - * will be a Councillor as at 1 April 2015

No candidate was disqualified at this stage. As the Impartial Assessor I checked the Policing Board's results and agreed with their determination. Monitoring information was removed and all applications forwarded to the HR provider.

Stage 2

16.2 Stage 2 is the responsibility of the Councils. However, as referred to previously in this report, the Policing Board were informed by the Councils that they were not in a position to undertake this task due to the workload involved in the Reform of Public Administration (RPA). The Policing Board appointed an outside Human Resource provider to undertake Stage 2. This HR provider was appointed in late February 2015.

16.3 The HR provider was experienced in running Civil Service and Public Appointments recruitment campaigns but had no experience in a recruitment process of this kind. The Policing Board officers had therefore to undertake a considerable amount of handholding and advice and guidance to ensure compliance with the Code

It took some persuasion to convince the HR provider that the Code of Practice produced by the Department of Justice was the relevant code for this recruitment process. The HR provider had assumed that the Civil service Code of Practice was relevant. Surprisingly, they had not read the 2012 Impartial Assessor's report prior to commencement of the recruitment process. This would have given them an insight into the recommendations contained in that report, all of which had been included in the Code of Practice. However, after some discussion, they took on board the requirements of the Code and duly put these into practice.

There is no suggestion that the process was compromised or that any candidate was disadvantaged in any way. The recruitment process was carried out entirely within the rules laid down in the DoJ Code of Practice March 2015.

16.4 A Core Process Manual, used in all of the previous recruitment process, had been written by previous recruitment consultants and modified slightly after the 2012 process. This was made available to the HR provider who preferred to use their own documentation which they applied to Civil Service and Public Appointments recruitment. Although I was unhappy about this, their documentation incorporated many of the forms contained in the Core Process Manual, albeit in a different format. However, there were two important documents omitted from their process:

- * shortlisting summary assessment form
- * interview summary assessment form

The purpose of both these forms is to record the panel's agreement to the list of those candidates shortlisted and the scores allocated at interview to each candidate. These forms should be signed by all panel members. It is important to have this recorded in the event of a tribunal case. There was a tribunal hearing following the 2012 PCSP recruitment. The documentation and recording of the recruitment process played a significant part in the Policing Board gaining a successful conclusion to the tribunal.

16.5 The Core Process Manual needs to be updated before the next PCSP recruitment to show that only 3 questions will be asked at interview stage and 20 minutes for each interview rather than 45 minutes. Also to show that candidates' experience in another council area (if relevant) may be taken into consideration. Both these changes were made during the course of 2015 competition, but need to be recorded in the Core Process Manual for future competitions. No candidate was disadvantaged because of these changes.

Recommendation: The Core Process Manual should be updated before the next PCSP competition.

Shortlisting

16.6 As the Impartial Assessor, I attended five of the shortlisting meetings

16.7 Shortlisting meetings were organised by the HR provider and commenced early March. This was quite an achievement considering that they were only appointed towards the end of February. The HR provider facilitated at these meetings, ensuring that the panel were familiar with the process and the completion of documentation.

16.8 The panel members were forwarded anonymised application forms prior to the shortlisting meeting to enable each individual panel member to record his/her decision before a collective decision was made on the day of the shortlisting meeting. Each panel member was required to record whether a candidate had 'met' or 'not met' the shortlisting criteria.

16.9 There was evidence that some panel members had not recorded their individual decisions. Some panel members advised that they had not received the papers in time to complete this work at home.

16.10 Good practice dictates that individual decisions should be recorded prior to a collective decision being taken. It will be a recommendation that this practice is mandatory during the next PCSP recruitment process.

16.12 Following the completion of the shortlisting exercise, the HR provider communicated to panel members the names of all successful applicants to ensure there were no conflicts of interest. This was a recommendation in the 2012 report.

16.13 The panel agreed interview dates, venues, timetables, questions and the allocation of questions. The panel were assisted by a list of questions contained in the Core Process Manual and on which they had been familiarised at the training sessions.

16.14 The panel were also given a rating scale to assist with scoring – again, they had been given training on how to use the rating scale.

Shortlisting Feedback

16.15 The HR provider notified unsuccessful candidates by email. Those who requested further feedback were forwarded a copy of the Chairperson's Summary. If this proved unsatisfactory to the candidate, he/she was referred to the Chairperson of the selection panel for further information.

16.16 Of the 414 applications received, 321 candidates were deemed appointable and 118 candidates were appointed. **Details at**

Appendix 4

16.17 As referred to earlier, it was necessary to re-advertise for applicants for Antrim and Newtownabbey, who received 24 applications and shortlisted 13 for interview. Similarly, Lisburn and Castlereagh re-advertised and received 21 applications and shortlisted 15 for interview.

Interviews

16.18 In my role as Impartial Assessor, I attended 10 interview days.

16.19 The HR provider advised candidates by email of the dates, time and venues of interviews. Whilst this was acceptable to the majority of candidates, who either confirmed their agreement or requested alternative dates, some 20 candidates did not attend and did not offer any explanation. Although they had not confirmed their attendance at interview, the HR provider scheduled them in for their appointment. This resulted in panels experiencing long periods of down-time, which caused considerable frustration. Some Independent Panel Members, in particular, expressed their dissatisfaction with what they described as 'a waste of their time'.

16.20 I am concerned that email was the only method of communication used by the HR provider and feel that those candidates who did not respond to emails inviting them to interview should immediately receive a hard copy letter by post if the candidate has not responded within 48 hours. Every effort should be made to make contact with candidates and those who did not respond following emails and letters by post, should not be listed for interview. This will save unnecessary down-time for panel members and will streamline the process.

Recommendation: Candidates who do not respond to emails within 48 hours inviting them for interview should receive hard copy letters by post with a request to respond within 48 hours.

16.21 Under the Guaranteed Interview Scheme candidates who met the eligible criteria were allowed to proceed to interview, without going through the shortlisting process. Some panel members were unhappy about this, but this is the rule under this scheme. The Policing Board may wish to review their decision to introduce this scheme for the next PCSP recruitment competition.

16.22 The HR provider had two staff members facilitating at each of the interview days. One to meet and greet the candidate and complete ID and the second member of staff to take notes during the interviews and to record the agreed score on the master Candidate Interview Assessment sheet. There was no overall Summary Interview Assessment Form completed and signed. This form is important as it records individual panel member's scores and reasons for any disparity in the scoring. Panel members should sign this form confirming their agreement to the final scores. The Summary Interview Assessment form was used in previous competitions and I have recommended earlier in this report that it should be used in future recruitment competitions. Because the HR provider used their own documentation, rather than the documentation in the Core Process Manual, this form was not part of their process.

16.23 However after discussions with them they agreed to complete the form for each of the council's interview days and, whilst this was of no real value as it had not been agreed and signed by panel members, it made easier the task of checking the documentation at the end of the process.

16.24 In general, the interviews went well, with the HR provider's staff well organised and helpful. Most councillors took their role seriously, whilst a few seemed disengaged from the process. There were varying degrees of ability, interest and attention from a few of the chairs, even though they had been through training for their role. This is not a new problem as previous Impartial Assessor reports have highlighted similar concerns. The Councils are responsible for nominating the councillor panellists and they have to ensure that they achieve the correct political balance, but this requirement can sometimes result in the appointment of councillor panellists with very little recruitment experience. This makes training before the process begins even more important.

16.25 The Policing Board was responsible for the recruitment of independent panel members. 16 were chosen from the Commission for Public Appointments' list of experienced assessors. For all of them, this was a new experience and some were more confident than others. Whilst the training sessions were informative some expressed the view that separate training sessions specifically geared to their role would have been helpful. None had read the Code of Practice prior to the training and were therefore unaware of the differences between the recruitment of independent members to PCSPs and the Public Appointments' process. However, they were all fully committed to their role and their general recruitment experience added considerable value to the shortlisting and interview processes. The more experienced assessors intervened, for example, when some councillors attempted to introduce outside information about candidates. Their independent role is a vital part of the process.

16.26 In total 308 candidates were interviewed. 281 passed their interview on merit and were deemed suitable to be considered for appointment as independent members of PCSPs. Lists for each council area were compiled and forwarded to the relevant council for their perusal, who then forwarded them to the Policing Board. The HR provider sent successful interview letters.

Checking of documentation

16.27 The Impartial Assessor is required to check all documentation relating to the recruitment process. Of vital importance is the checking of the lists, provided by the HR provider, of those candidates who have passed Stage 2 and are deemed suitable for appointment. These lists have to be verified before the Policing Board appointment panels meet to select candidates from the lists provided.

16.28 Over a period of 6 days at the HR provider's premises I conducted a thorough checking process to ensure that the information on those very important lists was 100% accurate. I wish to record my appreciation for the HR provider's co-operation in this exercise.

16.29 13 lists were checked – all 11 councils and the 2 extra competitions for Antrim and Newtownabbey and Lisburn and Castlereagh (referred to earlier).

16.30 Of the 13 lists checked there was an error on one list, which the HR provider quickly rectified, sending an amended list to the relevant council and the Policing Board.

16.31 The documentation showed careful attention by the HR provider's staff to the recording of their information at shortlisting and interview days, in particular their note taking during interviews. As the standard of note taking by panel members varied considerably, this record was of particular importance in the event of a challenge and a possible tribunal case.

16.32 As referred to earlier, the Interview Summary Assessment Forms were not used in the majority of interview days, but were completed on the HR provider's premises after the council's had selected the candidates at the end of Stage 2. The completion of these forms assisted in the checking process. On the one occasion the HR provider's facilitator did complete this form for the final competition several errors were found. The facilitator agreed to re-write the forms showing the correct allocation of marks from each panel member. This did not affect the overall results and no-one was disadvantaged because of these errors, as the agreed score for each candidate was recorded on the panel members' individual Candidate Assessment Booklet. However, best practice would dictate that an overall summary of scores agreed by the panel should be completed and signed by all panel members.

16.33 No-one could doubt the dedication of the HR provider's staff and their desire to provide a competent service. In their role as HR providers for Civil Service and Public Appointments competitions, they have developed a system which their staff observe, to the letter. They had some difficulty, at the beginning of the PCSP recruitment process in accepting that a tried and tested process, used successfully in previous DPP and PCSP competitions, was already in place and were reluctant to consider deviating from their usual system. They were uncomfortable with the level of scrutiny in this competition. In my meeting with the Commissioner for Public Appointments, he expressed similar concerns, some of which he has recorded both in his audit reports and 2014 Annual Report.

Council Panel Members

16.34 Many of the panel members are very experienced in recruitment processes and provide an excellent service. There were a small number who clearly did not have this experience and for whom the training was particularly important. For some, the delay between the training and commencement of recruitment of independent members to PCSPs meant that they had forgotten a lot of what they had learned.

16.35 This was particularly evident in the note taking, which, in some cases, was sparse, to say the least. Another concern was in the scoring which did not always reflect the written comments. Although there was always an agreed panel score, there was no recoding of how the panel had reached their decisions, especially when some panel members had recorded a score of say 3, but then agreed a panel score of 6. On some of the score sheets panel members had split their scores as 3 / 4,3 being a fail and 4 a pass. This is just not acceptable. Surprisingly at least one of the independent members scored in this way. In previous competitions the independent panel member and the HR observer intervened when concerned about these matters, but this happened very rarely this time around. The HR provider's facilitators did not have experience at interview level and only recorded results.

16.36 This is not a new problem. Previous Impartial Assessors' reports highlighted the same concerns. The training providers did cover the importance of note taking and very comprehensively explained the scoring system. Councils, when nominating councillor panel members have to be cognisant of the requirement to achieve a correct Political balance of councillors, but it is also important, to ensure that they have the skills and experience required to give candidates the best possible opportunity to give of their best at interview. I stress that these concerns apply only to a small number of councillors. The majority did perform their tasks to the required standard.

16.37 The 2012 Impartial Assessor's report recommended that there should be specific training for Chairs. The training providers set aside a full day for this exercise. All but one of the Chairs attended and the training was well structured. During my attendance at interview days, it was evident that many of the Chairs had benefitted from this training. However, I have to say that I witnessed very poor performances on two occasions, with concerns expressed from the independent panel members.

16.38 The quality and quantity of the Chairperson's Summary varied considerably. Many of the panel members had input into the content of the Chair's Summary, but in some cases, the Chair wrote the Summary without any reference to the other panel members. This is an important part of the documentation as the Chair's Summary is forwarded to unsuccessful candidates who request feedback. Some candidates, who received this feedback were unhappy with the information they received. This resulted in five being forwarded to the Independent Complaints Monitor.

Recommendation:

Councils, when selecting councillor panellists, should endeavour to select those who have the necessary skills and experience.

Training for chairs should be a priority for future recruitment competitions.

The Training Provider should work in tandem with the HR provider, with both using the same documentation.

Training should be completed close to the start date of the recruitment process to ensure that the learning is still fresh in the minds of the trainees.

17 Stage 3

Appointment panels training sessions

17.1 The Policing Board officers conducted training sessions for appointment panel members. These were well attended and very informative. The panel members were well prepared for their role in the appointment of independent members to the PCSPs.

17.2 The Code of Practice states at 3.61 that the Policing Board's panels should comprise at least two Policing Board members and an independent panel member appointed by the Policing Board. The Impartial Assessor is required to oversee the appointment process and to ensure that the Board's panel(s) is representative, so far as is practicable, in terms of gender and community background. Appointment panels were supported by a team of Policing Board officers.

17.3 Policing Board officers provided to the panel members the lists of candidates who had passed Stage 2 and who were deemed suitable for appointment as independent members to PCSPs. These lists were anonymised and candidates were referred to by their unique reference number.

17.4 Panel members were also given copies of the candidate's responses to Criterion 1 of anonymised applications forms to assist in their decision making. Criterion 1 asked candidates to provide evidence that would ' Demonstrate effective engagement in their Community, Local Policing or Community Safety Issues'.

17.4 For each council area, the panel was advised of the community breakdown to ensure that, as far as practicable, appointed independent members would be representative of the community in the district council area.

17.5 As recommended in the Impartial Assessor's 2012 report, panel members had access to scores when there were two or more candidates in the same category and there was a difficulty in deciding who was the better candidate. Skills and experience were taken into consideration as it is important to create an effective PCSP. Access to scores assisted in the decision making, although other factors, such as geography were taken into consideration. Having access to scores greatly assisted the panel and should be continued in future recruitment processes.

17.6 It is important to record that appointment panel members take their responsibilities very seriously. Long and detailed discussions take place before final decisions are agreed. Disqualification because of prior criminal convictions is considered after decisions have been made and acted upon if considered relevant.

17.7 Policing Board officers record all decisions and panel members sign the documentation.

17.8 The Policing Board issues appointment letters and provides feedback if requested.

17.9 The Policing Board must publish the composition of each PCSP and DPCSP through a press release. (Paragraph 3.76 of the Code of Practice).

18 Independent Complaints Monitor

18.1 Five complaints were referred to the Independent Complaints Monitor. These were scrutinised efficiently and expeditiously. Only one was upheld and negotiations are ongoing.

19 Recruitment of Young People

19.1 There was an increase in applications from young people. The Policing Board appointed 17 candidates in the '25 and under' category. This represented just over 14% of the total independent members appointed – an increase of 7% on the 2012 competition. This is very welcome and reflects the Policing Board's efforts in their awareness campaign.

20 Executive Summary and Recommendations

20.1 Summary

20.2 The Northern Ireland Policing Board carried out a recruitment process between November 2014 and August 2015, to appoint Independent Members to 11 District Council Policing and Community Safety Partnerships and the 4 Belfast District Policing and Community Safety Partnerships.

20.3 The process was conducted according to the Code of Practice issued by the Department of Justice (DoJ) in March 2015. The Code is issued under paragraph 6(2) of Schedule 1 and paragraph 6(2) of Schedule 2 to the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.

20.4 Although these appointments do not come within the remit of the Commissioner for Public Appointments, they are made using a process which follows the Commissioner's Code of Practice as best practice.

20.5 Policing and Community Safety Partnerships are statutory bodies established under the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 to help make communities safer.

20.6 The Code of Practice states, at paragraph 3.5 that the process must involve independent scrutiny at every stage. There were three levels of independent scrutiny.

* **Impartial Assessor**, appointed by the Policing Board at the start of the planning process. The role of the Impartial Assessor is to assess the process for openness, transparency, probity and effectiveness, to ensure compliance with the Code of Practice and to prepare a report for the Policing Board at the conclusion of the process.

* **Independent Assessors**, appointed by the Policing Board, taken from the Commissioner for Public Appointments' list of approved assessors. Independent Assessors are panel members with full voting rights.

* **Complaints Monitor** appointed by the Policing Board to investigate complaints. Five complaints were received. One was upheld.

Department of Justice Code of Practice March 2015

20.7 The Department of Justice issued a Code of Practice in March 2015. The code set out clearly guidance to District Councils, the Policing Board and all others involved in the recruitment process on their respective roles in the nomination and appointment of independent members to PCSPs and DPCSPs.

20.8 The code was amended to include recommendations by the Impartial Assessor in her 2012 report.

20.9 I am pleased to report that the recommendations in my 2012 report were successfully implemented in this recruitment process. Panels were made aware of the names of candidates following selection at shortlisting sessions, thus avoiding delays on interview days if a panel member had a conflict of interest. The availability of scores during the appointment process assisted the panel members in their selection of independent members to PCSPs and DPCSPs. Where there were two or more candidates considered equally suitable for appointment on the basis of representativeness scores were available to the panel to assist in their decision making.

20.10 Application forms were designed to make their completion by candidates more straightforward.

20.11 A very informative Information Booklet was produced by Policing Board officers to assist those interested in applying for independent membership of a PCSP or DPCSP.

20.12 **Guaranteed Interview Scheme (GIS)** In line with the Equality Commission's 'Positive Action for People who are Disabled guidance' the Policing Board invited applications from those who qualified under this scheme. There was some confusion with the reference in the Information Booklet to 'essential criteria' as the application form refers to 'eligible criteria'. If it is the intention of the Policing Board to offer the GIS in future recruitment competitions this should be amended. The majority of panel members were not aware of this scheme and not everyone was happy that some candidates' application forms were not judged by panel members at the shortlisting stage. There were 40 applications received under the Guaranteed Interview Scheme. Panel members should be given all relevant information on GIS at the training sessions.

20.13 Documentation relating to the recruitment process was checked thoroughly by me at the HR provider's premises. One list of appointable candidates had an error which was quickly rectified before the appointment panels met. As referred to earlier in this report, the HR providers preferred to use their own documentation rather than that provided in the Core Process Manual.

20.14 The Councils are responsible for Stage 2 of the recruitment process. However, at very short notice, they informed the Policing Board that they could not undertake this very important task, due to the workload involved in the Reform of Public Administration. As a result, the Policing Board had to go through a lengthy procurement process to appoint an outside Human Resource provider. The HR provider was appointed in February 2015, thus causing considerable delay in the commencement of the process.

20.15 The Policing Board officers and the HR provider are to be commended for the speed in which they got the recruitment process up and running.

20.16 The training provider appointed in November 2014 commenced training sessions at the beginning of December 2014. The training was well structured and informative. Due to the delay in the commencement of recruitment, some of the less experienced councillor panellists had difficulty remembering what they had learned. In future, training should be aligned more closely with the commencement of the recruitment process, although it must be remembered that the Policing Board was not responsible for the delay.

20.17 It was pleasing to see an increase in applications from young people. The Policing Board's awareness campaign included the use of social media and liaison with key stakeholders, through the Youth Advisor. Policing Board officers should be commended for their efforts which clearly had the desired effect. Of the total independent members appointed to PCSPs and DPCSPs 14% were under 25. This compares very favourably with the 2012 competition when 7% in the under 25 category were appointed.

Conclusion

20.18 I am pleased to report that the process to appoint independent members to the PCSPs and DPCSPs has been conducted in a manner that is fair, robust, open and transparent and complies with the Code of Practice issued by the Department of Justice in March 2015.

20.19 Policing Board members, Policing Board officers, the training provider and HR provider, together with councillor panellists and independent assessors have all contributed to the successful conclusion of this large scale and complicated recruitment process. The majority of participants were new to the process and experienced a steep learning curve. They are to be commended for their diligence and patience.

21. Recommendations

21.1 Responsibility for the Overall Process should remain with the Policing Board, who will make the final judgment on who is appointed as an Independent Member to PCSPs and DPCSPs. Independent Assessors, appointed by the Policing Board will be panel members with full voting rights.

21.2 **Stage 2 should remain the responsibility of District Councils.** They are supported by their Human Resource managers, who have expert knowledge in recruitment practices and are qualified to give expert HR advice to panel members. This was evident in the 2012 recruitment campaign to appoint independent members to PCSPs. The Reform of Public Administration is now complete, so they should be in a position to meet their responsibilities in the next recruitment round. The Code of Practice, at paragraph 3.40 states that Councils are responsible for Stage 2 recruitment competitions. **Councils should be put on notice that the Policing Board will expect them to undertake Stage 2 in the next 2018/2019 recruitment competition.**

Timing

21.3 All those involved in the recruitment campaign should be appointed early in the process to avoid time pressures.

Documentation

21.4 There should a review of documentation and the necessary amendments made to the Core Process Manual.

Guaranteed Interview Scheme (GIS)

21.5 A decision should be taken whether the GIS should be offered to applicants in the next recruitment round. If so, it should be clearly explained to panellists at the training sessions, to avoid confusion at the interview stages.

Training

21.6 The Code of Practice should be made available to all panel members prior to the training sessions. Policing Board officers would then be available to answer queries.

21.7 Training for all panel members should be more focussed on note taking and scoring.

21.8 Training for chairs should be continued.

21.9 Trainers and HR providers should use the same documentation

21.10 Training should include shortlisting processes

Contact with candidates

21.11 Contact with candidates should not be limited to emails. If a candidate does not respond to an email within 48 hours, a hard copy letter should be issued. This should reduce the number of 'no shows' on interview days. Candidates who have not responded should not be included on the interview schedule.

Recommendations in the 2012 report

21.12 The recommendations in the 2012 report were successfully implemented in the 2015 campaign and should be continued in future competitions.

Commissioner for Public Appointments

Although the competition to appoint Independent Members to PCSPs does not come within the remit of the Commissioner for Public Appointments, his Code of Practice was followed as best practice. In his Annual 2014 report the Commissioner is critical of Government about the lack of progress on diversity within the Public Appointments arena. I was pleased to report to him that the PCSP recruitment process addresses this problem very well, as PCSPs reflect the community they serve.

Finally. I would like to thank the Policing Board for giving me the opportunity, yet again, to act as the Impartial Assessor. I have thoroughly enjoyed the experience and it was a privilege to work with the Policing Board members, Policing Board officers and all others involved in the recruitment process.

Gwen Savage

Impartial Assessor

October 2015

Appendix 1

Appendix 2

PCSP Independent Member Appointments – Advertisement



Do you have an interest in local Policing or do you want to play a part in making your community safer?

INDEPENDENT MEMBERS

Policing & Community Safety Partnerships (PCSPs)

The Policing Board is looking to appoint independent members to the 11 Policing and Community Safety Partnerships (PCSPs) which are being reconstituted in April 2015 as the result of the changes to local Government.

PCSPs are statutory bodies established under the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011. There are 11 PCSPs – one for each of the council areas in Northern Ireland. Belfast has one overarching PCSP and four District Policing and Community Safety Partnerships (DPCSPs), for the North, South, East and West of the city.

Who can apply?

We are looking for people who can represent their community and convey local opinion on the policing issues and concerns most affecting their area. To be considered you must:

- be able to demonstrate effective engagement and an active interest in your community; or policing; or community safety;
- live in, or be able to show you have a close connection with the Council area for which you are making an application;
- be able to work as part of a team to meet the PCSP objectives; and
- be able to communicate effectively orally and in writing.

These positions are not remunerated. The payment of reasonable expenses incurred in connection with PCSP member duties is currently under review.

Information Evenings

The Board is holding information evenings to give people the chance to learn more about this role.

For more information, go to the Policing Board website at www.nipolicingboard.org.uk

How can I apply?

Visit www.nipolicingboard.org.uk/pcsprecruitment

Telephone (028) 9040 8500

Application forms can be provided in a range of accessible formats and candidates who require assistance will be facilitated on request.

Completed application forms must be returned no later than 5pm on Friday 28 November 2014.

The Northern Ireland Policing Board is committed to equality of opportunity.



Appendix 3

Detail

Below is detail and analysis, where possible, of the activities undertaken by the Communications Branch to support awareness raising of the appointment process.

Newspaper advertising

An advertisement (see annex 2) was placed in the 4 of the main daily newspapers as outlined in the table below.

Newspaper	Circulation	Size of Advert	Date Published	Cost
Belfast Telegraph	47,528	¼ page (17cm x 13.4cm) Friday / Sunday	7/11/14 and 9/11/14	£3077.68
Irish News	40,236	¼ page (17 cm x 13.1 cm)	6/11/14	£1098.20
News Letter	19,550	17 x 4 (cols)	6/11/14	£1360.00
Daily Mirror	46,019	¼ page	6/11/14	£537.20

Information Evenings

The Partnership Directorate also organised 5 Information evenings which were promoted by the Communications Branch (see Annex 3). These events included input from PCSP Managers / Independent Members, PSNI, Board Members and officials and were held in the following areas:

- Irvinestown, Enniskillen
- Bangor
- Coleraine
- Cookstown
- Belfast

Video Advertisement

The Communications Branch produced an in - house video with available equipment and software, which was uploaded onto the Board's YouTube channel available to view at www.youtube.com/watch?v=qe-ePhc0Dkw.

Press Releases / Articles

- A press release was distributed to all media on 6 November 2014 (see Annex 4).
- A generic article was sent to the regional newspapers which included a quote from an Independent Member from that area. It also highlighted the date, time and venue of the PCSP information evenings which were held in 5 locations across NI (see Annex 5).

Media Coverage

The below table details the media coverage, broadcast and print, the campaign received during its run.

Broadcast / Print	Detail	Date
Radio Foyle	As part of Board Meeting in public in Derry coverage	6/11/14
Co Down Spectator	Article published	7/11/14
Farming Life	As part of conference report - Encouraging people from farming community to apply	8/11/14
Strabane Weekly News	Press release used	12/11/14
Farm Week	Encouraging people from farming community to apply	13/11/14
Strabane Weekly News	UFU encourage people from farming community to apply	19/11/14

Northern Visions TV	Current PCSP Independent Members being interviewed about the role.	20/11/14
---------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Board / PCSP Website Statistics

A PCSP recruitment page was created on both the Board and PCSP websites and relevant documents uploaded. An online applications form was also available to complete on both websites. During the campaign online users were predominantly directed to the recruitment page on the Board’s website.

	Policing Board	PCSP
Recruitment Page (visits / views)	14,962 / 18,484	232 / 364
Advert (downloads)	1,190	29
Information Flyers (Downloads)	190	8
Information Booklet (Downloads)	564	37

Board / PCSP Social Media Sites - Analytics

Both the Board and PCSP’s Facebook pages and Twitter accounts were extensively used to promote the campaign and the information evenings held.

It was also agreed with the PSNI Digital Hub Manager that posts / tweets would be shared / retweeted across PSNI Facebook pages and Twitter accounts. Figures (as of 30/11/13) for PSNI Social Media sites were as follows:

- Facebook likes - 186,500
- Twitter followers - 134,500
- 16% (approx.) of users are females aged 16-25
- 14% (approx. of users are males aged 16-25
- In some areas, for example West Belfast, 27% of users are males aged 18-24.

	Policing Board	PCSP
No of Facebook Posts	43	43 (via shares)
No. of Facebook Likes	451	206
Facebook Reach	927,683	13,905
No. of Tweets	47	41
No. of Retweets	158	78
No. of Youtube views	680	N/A

Awareness Raising - Other Organisations

Information on the PCSP appointment campaign was also circulated to the below organisations requesting that the advert (both the pdf and video), flyers promoting the information evenings and links to the recruitment pages on the Board and PCSP websites were posted on any online sites and distributed to key stakeholders. There was also encouragement to support the campaign through likes / shares / retweets of any relevant posts on the Board and PCSPs' Social Media sites.

- *PCSP Managers*

The following PCSPs have also set up Facebook pages:

- Antrim
- Armagh

- Coleraine
- Craigavon
- Derry
- Magherafelt
- Newry and Mourne
- *Designated Bodies* (via Communications Managers)
 - NI Fire and Rescue Service
 - Probation Board for NI
 - Youth Justice Agency
 - Housing Executive
 - Health and Social Care Trusts
 - Education and Library
- *Youth Advisory Panel* (YAP) – The panel comprises representatives (currently 26) from organisations who work with young people or represent the rights of young people. These include PSNI, Include Youth, Public Achievement, NICCY, Children’s Law Centre and Youth Action
- *Strategic Consultation Group* – Established jointly by the Board and PSNI the group has representation from the following section 75 groups:
 - Minority Ethnic
 - Women
 - Older Persons
 - People with a disability
 - Young People
 - Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Trans (LGBT).
- *HRConnect* – The advertisement was published in the Weekly Opportunities Bulletin and the NICS internal website.
- *Churches* (via Communications Managers)

- Catholic
- Presbyterian
- Anglican
- Methodist
- Church of Ireland
- *Voluntary / Community Groups*
 - Community NI Forum - <http://www.communityni.org/news/policing-and-community-safety-partnerships-information-evenings>
 - North Down Community Network - <http://ndcn.co.uk/13th-nov-pcsp-information-evening-aurora-bangor/>
 - Volunteer Now - 2 news items and 1 event were published on their website:
 - <http://www.volunteernow.co.uk/news/item/632/independent-members-of-the-policing-and-community-safety-partnerships/?keywords=pcsp>
 - <http://www.volunteernow.co.uk/events/item/716/?keywords=pcsp>
 - <http://www.volunteernow.co.uk/events/item/716/?keywords=pcsp>
 - NI Council for Voluntary Action (NICVA)
- Universities – QUB and UUU
 - QUB - The advertisement was forwarded to all students who have previously expressed interest in volunteering within a policing context or in relation to community safety. It was also placed in the QUB newsletter and posted on social media.
- HR Connect – The advertisement was posted on the Weekly Opportunities Bulletin and the NICS internal website.
- Councils

Appendix 4

PCSPs/DPCSPs - analysis of independent members appointed by Policing Board

PCSP/ DPCSP	Determined size of Partnership		Community Background						Gender		Age (25 and under)		Age (26 - 40)		Age (41 - 60)		Age (61 and over)		Persons declaring political activity		Persons with a Disability		Ethnic minority persons		LOST persons			
	Political member posts	Independent member posts	Appointable Candidates						Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates		Appointable candidates			
			Grth.	Prof.	Other	Prof.	Grth.	Other	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile	Milit	Femile
Antrim and Newtownabbey	10	9	6	16	1	4	8	0	14	9	5	4	0	0	2	10	4	7	3	13	6	6	3	0	0	0	0	
Ards and North Down	10	9	3	15	2	2	6	1	11	9	2	7	2	1	4	8	4	6	3	9	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	
Armagh City Banbridge and Craigavon	10	9	9	16	0	5	4	0	17	8	4	5	7	3	5	11	2	2	1	13	5	1	0	0	0	2	2	
Belfast Principal	9	8	21	17	3	4	3	1	29	12	2	6	1	0	6	12	6	5	2	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	
North Belfast	6	5	6	6	2	1	2	2	9	4	3	2	2	1	1	5	3	1	0	7	4	2	1	0	0	1	1	
South Belfast	6	5	7	5	1	3	1	1	8	5	4	1	1	1	1	5	3	3	1	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	
East Belfast	6	5	1	10	0	0	5	0	6	5	3	2	0	0	4	6	3	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
West Belfast	6	5	15	3	0	5	0	0	12	6	1	4	4	2	4	4	1	2	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Causeway Coast and Glens	10	9	9	19	2	5	3	1	21	9	3	6	2	2	5	13	5	10	0	13	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Down City and Strabane	10	9	9	6	1	6	2	1	8	8	4	5	0	0	4	10	5	2	1	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	
Fermanagh and Omagh	10	9	14	8	5	5	3	1	12	15	2	7	4	2	4	10	2	9	4	13	4	3	1	1	1	1	0	
Lisburn and Castlereagh	10	9	3	19	2	3	5	1	12	12	2	7	2	1	2	13	6	7	2	6	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	
Mid and East Antrim	10	9	5	12	1	3	6	0	8	10	3	6	2	2	3	7	3	6	2	10	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	
Mid Ulster	10	9	9	14	1	6	2	1	14	10	3	6	3	2	4	12	3	5	1	7	2	3	2	1	1	0	0	
Newry Mourne and Down	10	9	11	5	2	6	2	1	11	7	3	6	1	0	4	8	5	5	2	9	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Total number of posts	133	118					58	49			44	74		17		24			140	51		23		28	13	4	4	6