

## Minutes of the 118<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Office for Legal Complaints (OLC)

Wednesday 26 January 2022 10:30 – 14:40

By video call

<p><b>Present:</b>          Elisabeth Davies, Chair          Lis Bellamy          Annette Lovell          Hari Punchihewa          Alison Sansome          Dale Simon          Martin Spencer</p> <p><b>Apologies</b>          Jane Martin</p> <p><b>Board Secretary</b>          Kay Kershaw</p>	<p><b>In attendance:</b>          Paul McFadden, Chief Ombudsman          Sandra Strinati, Chief Operating Officer          Steve Pearson, Head of Complex Casework and Deputy Chief Ombudsman          Michael Letters, Head of Finance          Debra Wright, Head of Head of People Strategy and Services          Laura Stroppolo, Head of Head of Programme Management and Assurance</p> <p>Luke Hutcheson (items 8 and 9)          Deb McIntyre, Operations Manager (item 9)          David Peckham, Operations Manager (item 9)          Treena Mosely, Operations Manager (item 9)          Mark Persard, Operations Manager (item 9)          Nicola Sinclair, EDI Manager (item 12)</p>
---	---

### Preliminary issues:

The Board meeting was quorate.

### Item 1 – Welcome, apologies and declarations of interest

1. The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.
2. Apologies from Jane Martin were noted.
3. There were no declarations of interest reported.

### Item 2 – Previous Minutes

4. The minutes of the OLC Board meeting held on 14 December 2021 were **approved** for accuracy and **approved** for publication.
5. The minutes of the ARAC meeting held on 6 October 2021 were **approved** for publication.

6. The minutes of the RemCo meeting held on 17 November 2021 were **approved** for publication.

**ACTION: Board Secretary to publish the minutes of the:**

- **OLC Board meeting held on 14 December 2021.**
- **The ARAC meeting held on 6 October 2021.**
- **The RemCo meeting held on 17 November 2021.**

### **Item 3 – Matters arising and outstanding actions from previous meetings**

7. Action 13, Paragraph 68 from the May 2021 Board meeting: Clarity was sought on the revised timescale for sharing the findings and proposed actions from the Quality Assurance Framework review. In response, the Board was advised that:
- A preliminary review of the Quality Assurance Framework had been completed in 2021; this had highlighted the need for a more detailed and wider ranging review to be undertaken.
  - Completion of this wider ranging review was dependent on the appointment of a Quality Manager. Appointing to this role had been challenging and the Executive was now considering a range of alternative permanent and interim recruitment options.
  - Once appointed, the Quality Manager would expedite the detailed review of the Quality Assurance Framework. The Executive would then be able to confirm the revised timescale for sharing the findings and proposed actions arising from this review.
8. It was **agreed** that a further update on the progress being made to appointment a Quality Manager and the revised timescale for sharing the findings of the Quality Assurance Framework review would be provided at the March Board meeting.
- ACTION: The Deputy Chief Ombudsman to update the Board on the progress being made to appointment a Quality Manager and the revised timescale for sharing the findings of the Quality Assurance Framework review at the March Board meeting.**
9. The Board requested that the action log was updated to reflect the update provided at this meeting on this outstanding action.
- ACTION: The Board Secretary to update the actions log to reflect the update provided on action 13, paragraph 68 from the May 2021 Board meeting.**
10. Operational quality reviews continued to be undertaken, despite the Quality Manager vacancy.
11. The COO reported on a pilot being undertaken to trial a less burdensome and more flexible process for operational investigations which aimed to reduce investigation time and enable investigators to achieve more outcomes for customers.
12. Board **noted** the update on previous actions.

#### Item 4 – Executive report

13. The Chief Ombudsman reported on a meeting that had taken place with the Bar Council to discuss the OLC's proposed Scheme Rules changes, and how some of the changes being proposed by the OLC / LeO were aligned to those proposed by the Bar Council.
14. The Bar Council had committed to undertake a more detailed review of some of the specific drafting changes with a view to providing further feedback in due course.
15. Considering that approval for some of the Scheme Rules changes could be received as early as Q1, the Board sought the Executive's views on factoring in the impact of these changes into performance forecasts. In response the CO advised that:
  - The Board's Scheme Rules Sub-Committee had begun to consider this.
  - It would be challenging to model the wide range of impact that the various Scheme Rule changes would have on performance forecasts with any degree of confidence at the present time; further assessment and modelling would first be required.
  - Data from the pilots focussing on proportionality and demand management might enable the Executive to undertake some modelling at the end of Q4 on the impact of some of the Scheme Rule changes.
  - The Executive was considering how best to reflect the proposed Scheme Rules changes in the waterfall diagram that would be included in the Budget Acceptance Criteria to be submitted to the LSB in February.
16. The Board suggested that a representation of the proposed Scheme Rule changes was included in the waterfall diagram to be included in the Budget Acceptance Criteria to be submitted to the LSB in February, and that placeholders were added for items that could not yet be quantified.

**ACTION: The Executive to include a representation of the proposed Scheme Rules changes in the waterfall diagram within the Budget Acceptance Criteria and add placeholders for those items that could not yet be quantified.**
17. The CO updated the Board on the status of the waterfall diagram, advising that in response to a request from the LSB, costs associated with the performance improvement initiatives were to be included. The Executive hoped to be able to share the diagram with the Board and LSB Executive for further feedback within the next week.
18. The Board was keen to understand the timeframes for implementing any approved Scheme Rule changes and when the impact of those changes on performance improvement could be expected. The Board was advised that:
  - Scheme Rule changes associated with Rule 5.7 - discretion for dismissal of cases - could be implemented by the end of Q1, beginning of Q2; the impact of these changes on performance improvement would be seen quite quickly.
  - Scheme Rule changes associated with time limits would require a transitional period of approximately 3-6 months or longer; the impact of these changes on performance improvement would take longer to be seen.
  - IT and business process changes would be required before some of the Scheme Rule changes could be implemented; this would need to be factored in and would have an impact on when performance improvement would be seen.

- Some Scheme Rule changes would require legislative changes which would take longer to impact on performance improvement.

19. The Board requested further information to be presented at the March Board meeting on the quantification of the impact and timing of the Scheme Rule changes.

**ACTION: The Deputy Chief Ombudsman to present information on the quantification of the impact and timing of the Scheme Rule changes at the March Board meeting.**

20. Reflecting on the Government's advice to return to work from the office, the Board requested an update on how LeO's hybrid working model was evolving and whether there would be any implications for staff living further away from the office. In response the CO reported that:

- LeO's proposed hybrid working model had been successfully piloted between August and December 2021 and had now been confirmed and formally adopted.
- The pilot had highlighted the benefits of collaborative working. In response to staff feedback, further consideration was being given to providing more spaces within the office for collaborative working and to more effective ways for teams to work collaboratively when team members were not all in the office on the same day.
- Following the Government's announcement to return to the office, staff had requested a period of adjustment to enable them to make arrangements for those they cared for. The Executive had therefore agreed that some flexibility to the hybrid working model would be put in place until the end of February 2022, after which all staff would be expected to work in line with the hybrid working model unless they had an individual flexible working arrangement in place.
- Applications for individual flexible working arrangements would be considered in line with LeO's flexible working policy.

21. In discussion, the Board commented on the need to ensure clear and robust policies and processes were in place to support LeO's hybrid working approach. The Executive confirmed that the new Performance Management Framework was to be presented to RemCo for consideration at its meeting in February; the hybrid working model had been factored into all the policies and processes within this framework.

22. The Board commented on the absence of recent updates on priority three of the 2020/21 Business Plan and requested more frequent updates. In response, the CO:

- Confirmed that progress had been made on priority three of the business plan: the Service Provider Advice Line had gone live, and the Board had made some key decisions on how to progress the transparency agenda at the December Board meeting.
- Offered to provide a Programme Management update on priority 3 to the Board as part of future updates.
- Confirmed that updates on all Business Plan priorities would be included in future Board reports.

**ACTION: The Head of Programme Management and Assurance to share a Programme Management update on the 2021/22 Business Plan priority 3 with the Board.**

**ACTION: The Executive to ensure that updates on all Business Plan priorities were included in future Board reports.**

23. The Board **noted** the Executive report.

#### **Item 5 – ARAC update**

24. The ARAC Chair reported on the ARAC meeting that had taken place on 10 January 2022. The following key points were made:

- Having been satisfied that the Executive had fully adopted the budget setting assurance plan agreed by ARAC in 2021, the Committee had been assured on the 2022/23 budget setting process adopted by the Executive.
- ARAC had sought additional assurance on monitoring and forecasting to support better business planning.
- ARAC had considered a risk assurance paper, which included updates on key strategic risks and issues, operational risks, and proposals on risk appetite and risk rating. The Committee had supported the proposals on risk appetite and risk rating, which were now being developed further with a view to being presented to Board for future consideration and approval.
- External Audit and the Head of Finance were finalising the audit plan for the 2021/22 audit of Financial Statements.
- GIAA was on track to deliver the 2021/22 internal audit plan, despite a delay in commencement of the audit of Recruitment. Fieldwork for the audit of Performance Reporting had been completed and the final audit report would be presented at the ARAC meeting in March.
- ARAC had been pleased with the improvements that had been made on financial governance.
- A detailed discussion had taken place about the 2021/22 financial underspend and the Committee had been assured by the controls and plans in place to mitigate the risk of another underspend at the end of 2022/23.
- The Committee had considered the budgetary risks associated with planned over recruitment in 2022/23 and had stressed the need for mitigating action if financial forecasts indicated an overspend at year end.

25. The Internal Audit on the Budget and Business Planning Process had been scheduled for Q1 2022/23.

26. Meetings for the Executive to further develop the risk appetite proposals had been scheduled, but progress on this work would be reliant on the appointment of a risk Manager.

27. The Board **noted** the ARAC update.

#### **Item 6 – Finance report**

28. The Board sought assurance on the action being taken to break the cycle of budgetary underspend in 2022/23.

29. The Head of Finance reported that the 2022/23 budget forecast would be carefully monitored to mitigate the risk of both a budgetary overspend and underspend. Improved controls and organisational processes had been put in place to ensure that vacancies and recruitment were

being closely monitored to assess their impact on performance and budgetary forecasts; this would enable appropriate mitigating action would be taken promptly to address any risks associated with an underspend or overspend. The vacancy factor had been taken into account and increased to an appropriate level based on learning, reflections and previous Board feedback.

30. The ARAC Chair stressed the importance of maintaining focus and discipline on monitoring the budget throughout the year.
31. Following discussion, the Board **noted** the finance report.

### **Item 7 – Annual Report and Accounts 2020/21: Lessons Learned**

32. ARAC had considered the lessons learned from the 2020/21 Annual Report and Accounts at its meeting in January.
33. Planning for the External Audit of 2021/22 Financial Statements was underway with External Auditors.
34. The 2021/22 Annual Report and Accounts Programme Plan was being developed and meetings with key staff to launch the 2021/22 Annual Report and Accounts process had been scheduled for February.
35. The Board was asked to provide feedback on the structure and content of the 2021/22 Annual Report and Accounts. The following key points were made:
  - The progress that had made on the performance improvement journey and the extent of the work that had been completed despite the very challenging year should be emphasised.
  - Benchmarks should be included in the report to provide a wider perspective to stakeholders on the progress that had been made.
  - Emphasise that the progress made had been part of a two-year Business Plan and that LeO had delivered much of what it said it would do in year one.
  - Include a forward look, aligned to the Business Plan, to draw attention to the performance trajectories and set out the scale of ambition.
  - Consider changing the style, tone and look of the Annual Report and Accounts to reflect the CO's style of leadership.
36. The Head of Programme Management and Assurance reported that a designer was to be procured and appointed by the end of the financial year; they would focus on changing the style, tone and look of the Annual Report and Accounts.
37. The Head of Finance confirmed that provision for the costs associated with the external spend on the design and production of the Annual Report and Accounts would be made.
38. The Board was advised that a further update on the progress being made on the 2021/22 Annual Report and Accounts would be provided at the March Board meeting.
39. **The Board noted the update on the Annual Report and Accounts 2020/21: Lessons Learned and the planning for the Annual Report and Accounts 2021/22.**

## Item 8 – People and Performance

### Performance Report

40. The Board thanked the COO for the very clear performance report.
41. In response to a point of clarification, the COO confirmed that the Agreed Data Set and the Performance Report differentiated between cases closed through the investigative process and early resolution; the actual number of customers helped to a conclusion being the sum of these closures.
42. Responding to a suggestion to report only on total case closures, the COO explained that the Performance and Quality Task and Finish Group had agreed not to make any changes the way case closures were reported mid-year because it would conflate information set out in the Agreed Data Set. Work was underway to enable reporting on total case closures in 2022/23.
43. The Board sought assurance on the accuracy of performance forecasting and was advised that month on month assumptions were broadly accurate. Regular cross-departmental meetings took place to assess the key data underpinning the assumptions which ensured robust forecasting and action to be taken to adjust the assumptions and trajectories if required.
44. Further assurance was sought on the accuracy of quarter-by-quarter performance forecasting. Following discussion, it was **agreed** that future Board performance reports would include information on performance forecasting variations to enable a quarter-by-quarter comparisons to be made.

**ACTION: The Business Intelligence Manager to include information on performance forecasting variations in future performance reports presented to the Board to enable a quarter-by-quarter comparisons to be made.**

45. Having sought clarity on whether provision had been made for any seasonal variance in the 2021/22 Business Plan forecasts, the COO reported that no such provision had been made but this was to be addressed by the new Business Intelligence Manager who would be reviewing the impact of seasonality on performance and considering how that provision was built into future Business Plan forecasts.
46. The Board considered whether a Covid variance should be modelled and factored into future performance forecasts. In discussion, the COO advised that modelling and forecasting Covid variance would be possible, but expressed some hesitancy in doing so for the following reasons:
- Temporary changes made to LeO's sickness absence policy introduced in the early stages of the pandemic meant that there would be an absence of any baseline data to underpin this modelling and forecasting.
  - Any such modelling and forecasting would be based on an unknown Covid impact.
  - Modelling and forecasting against unknown and untested data could have adverse implications on performance trajectories, which in turn may impact on confidence levels.
47. The COO explained that Covid related absences were now being actively managed in line with LeO's pre-Covid sickness absence policy with a view to mitigating any risk to performance. A revised sickness absence policy was to be presented to RemCo for approval in February as part of a suite of new and revised policies that sat within LeO's new Performance Management Framework; this Framework would ensure a robust approach to sickness and performance management in the 2022/23.

48. In discussion, it was suggested that an alternative approach to managing the impact of Covid on future performance would be through active risk management, with a specific risk associated with the ongoing impact of the pandemic on performance included on the Risk register.
49. It was **agreed** that the Executive would give further consideration to the best way of managing the risk of Covid on performance.
50. **ACTION: The Executive to give further consideration to the best way of managing the risk of Covid on performance.**
51. COO reported that the Performance and Quality Task and Finish Group had reviewed a range of assumptions underpinning the performance trajectories and offered to include this information in Performance reports presented to the Board. The Board confirmed that it would be helpful to have sight of this information.
- ACTION: The Business Intelligence Manager to provide information on the range of assumptions underpinning the performance trajectories that had been reviewed by Performance and Quality Task and Finish Group in Performance reported presented to the Board.**
52. COO reported on the emerging cultural changes being seen because of LeO's pro-active approach towards addressing operational performance variation.

#### People Report

53. The Board had been pleased to note the successful outcome of LeO's first national recruitment campaign, recognising the significant amount of work it had entailed.
54. The Board reflected on organisational challenges around recruitment and retention and was keen to ensure that active steps were being taken to fill vacant roles and to mitigate the risk of any further attrition. In response the following key points were made:
- The job market was buoyant, providing easier opportunities for LeO's staff to move on.
  - A benchmarking exercise was being undertaken to compare LeO's attrition rates against those of other similar ALBs.
  - Exit interviews cited career progression, lack of training and development, and pay and reward as the main reasons for staff leaving LeO. The delivery of the People Strategy would address many of these points.
  - The 2021 Civil Service Survey results were being analysed to identify any issues relating to recruitment and retention and specific plans would be drawn up to address them.
  - A pay benchmarking exercise was currently being undertaken.
  - LeO's new Performance Management Framework had been developed to minimise attrition and would provide a clear structure for performance management; this included an improved appraisal process and a process for considering career development and training needs. Subject to RemCo's approval, this Framework would be introduced by year end.
55. A request was made for information on planned (expected) and unplanned (unexpected) attrition and the Head of People Services and Strategy **agreed** to give further thought to how this information could be presented.



**ACTION: The Head of People Services and Strategy to consider how best to provide the Board with information on planned (expected) and unplanned (unexpected) attrition.**

56. The Board requested that the results of the 2021 Civil Service Survey were compared to the results of the surveys undertaken in 2019 and 2020 to ensure that all key issues were identified and addressed. In response, the Head of People Services and Strategy confirmed that this information would be presented at the March Board.

**ACTION: The Head of People Services and Strategy to present a comparison of the Civil Service Survey results for 2019, 2020 and 2021 at the March Board meeting.**

57. The Board sought clarity on the working arrangements in place for staff appointed through the national recruitment campaign and how these arrangements aligned with those in place for existing staff. In response, the COO advised that:

- Employment offers had been made to 42 people based in different locations around the country.
- Offers had been made on the basis that people living within a one-hour commutable distance from Birmingham would be expected to attend the office for 40% of their working week, and work from home for 60% of their working week. This was the same hybrid working arrangement in place for existing staff.
- Staff living more than a one-hour commutable distance from Birmingham would be expected to work from home on a permanent basis, but if LeO subsequently opened a regional hub within a one-hour commutable distance from their home, they would then be expected to work from the hub 40% of their working week and from home for 60% of their working week .
- Flexible working applications would be considered in line with the policy for existing staff.

58. The Board **noted** the update on People and Performance.

### **Item 9 – Reducing the backlog**

59. The Board thanked Operations Managers for their clear report on reducing the PAP.

60. In discussion, Operations Managers explained the rationale for the Ideas Station review, drawing the Board's attention to the following key points:

- The Ideas Station was to be re-focussed to ensure that all ideas targeted specific areas of the PAP.
- Ideas for other areas of the business would be redirected to other improvement workstreams.
- Staff communications would be issued to explain the renewed focus; how the ideas put forward so far had been taken forward, and to encourage new ideas to be put forward.

61. The Board sought clarity on whether targets and measures had been put in place to demonstrate the impact and progress being made by the PAP reduction activities. In response, the following key points were made:

- Where possible, targets and milestones had been put in place for PAP reduction activities.

- Some activities, including the pilot being undertaken by the GETi Team, were less easy to quantify up-front. These activities were facilitators to improvement and were being monitored. If successful, these activities would be introduced into the business process, where their impact and progress would become quantifiable.
- The objective for all PAP reduction activities was to improve productivity, timeliness and the overall customer experience, through small changes in the business process.
- As a result of the small changes that had been made so far, the investigation time for low complexity cases had reduced by 16% over the year.

62. Operations Manager, Mark Persard, introduced himself and provided an overview of his key areas of responsibility.

63. Board **noted** the update on reducing the backlog.

### **Item 10 – Update from the Performance and Quality Task and Finish Group**

64. The Chair of the Performance and Quality Task and Finish Group reported on a meeting that had taken place to review the Budget Acceptance Criteria. The following key points were drawn to the Board's attention:

- The focus of the meeting had been on criteria 1 and 2. The Group had been satisfied with the answers provided to the questions posed for criteria 2 but had suggested further work to improve responses to the questions posed for criteria 1.
- The Group had felt that the Budget Acceptance Criteria document was starting to take shape, but would continue to scrutinise the clarity of messaging, particularly regarding performance, cost and the various budgetary options, the presentation and formatting when the document was next presented.

65. The OLC Chair sought clarity on whether the 2022/23 Business Plan would reference two different budgetary options in the same way that the Budget Acceptance Criteria did. In response, the CO confirmed that the 2022/23 Business Plan would likely refer to two different budgetary options, subject to further consideration, and would set out the impact each would have on performance. The Executive would also be considering how to factor into the budgetary options an inflationary pay award.

66. The Board **noted** the update from the Performance and Quality Task and Finish Group.

### **Item 11 – The 2022/23 Budget and Business Plan**

67. The Head of Head of Programme Management and Assurance updated the Board on the progress being made on the 2022/23 Budget and Business Plan and the Budget Acceptance Criteria. The following key points were made:

- The 2022/23 Business Plan and the Budget Acceptance Criteria were in the final stages of drafting.
- Significant improvement had been made to the drafting process this year; the Executive had worked more collaboratively, and the Performance and Quality Task and Finish Group had reviewed the Budget Acceptance Criteria.

- The LSB had confirmed that the Budget Acceptance Criteria should be a standalone document with no appendices.
- A Lead Drafter had been appointed and would be focusing on the tone, messaging and format of the Business Plan.
- The Executive and Board would be taking part in a performance reporting workshop in February.
- A draft of the 2022/23 Business Plan would be shared with the OLC Chair on 28 January for review and comment; further follow up meetings had been scheduled.
- The 2022/23 Business Plan and the Budget Acceptance Criteria would be shared with the Board on 4 February for review and further comment.
- Delegated approval would be sought for the OLC Chair to approve the final 2022/23 Business Plan and the Budget Acceptance Criteria before its submission to the LSB.

**68.** The Board was asked to provide comments on the format, content, key messages and critical points it would expect to see included in the 2022/23 Business Plan. The following comments were made:

- There should be clear differentiation between what ‘will’ be done and what ‘might’ be done in the Business Plan.
- There should also be a clear differentiation between the performance targets the OLC will commit to and those it will aspire to.

**69.** The Board **noted** the Budget and Business Plan Milestone report.

### **Item 12 – EDI Update**

**70.** The EDI Manager reported on the progress that had been made on setting up the EDI Steering Group and its role in driving the EDI agenda and ensuring that the EDI strategy was embedded in all policies, practices and activities.

**71.** Dale Simon had been appointed Board Sponsor for EDI and Chair of the EDI Steering Group.

**72.** The Board would receive 6-monthly EDI updates.

**ACTION: The EDI Manager to notify the Board Secretary of EDI reporting dates to be added into the Board’s forward plan.**

**73.** A Board member sought assurance on whether the membership of the EDI Steering Group was sufficiently diverse and representative of staff with different levels of experience from across the organisation. In response the following key points were made:

- The EDI Steering Group would operate at a strategic level, making it less suitable for a wide range of staff to attend.
- Representatives from LeO’s network groups would be invited to attend EDI Steering Group meetings on rotation and this would ensure views were received from staff with different levels of experience.

- EDI sub-groups and focus groups may be set up from time to time to consider specific aspects of EDI; consideration would be given to ensuring that these groups were sufficiently diverse and representative of the wider workforce.

**74.** Reflecting on the national recruitment campaign, assurance was sought on whether the range of applications received, and employment offers made, had been sufficiently scrutinised to ensure that EDI had been taken into account. In response, the following key points were made:

- Recruitment data was being monitored.
- Recruitment benchmarking data would be presented at the March Board.
- All applications were blind sifted to remove bias and the appointment panel was diverse.
- Improvements were being made to the way EDI recruitment data was collated and monitored.

**ACTION: Board Secretary to update the Board forward plan for March to reflect that EDI benchmarking data on recruitment would be presented to the Board.**

**75.** The Board reviewed the EDI Steering Group's Terms of Reference (ToRs).

**76.** A recommendation was made for a vision statement to be added to the ToRs at some point in the future. In discussion, it was suggested that this should be done once the EDI strategy had developed and the EDI Steering Group became more established. The EDI vision statement would need to be developed following consultation and be aligned to the Business Plan and People Plan.

**77.** The Board thanked the EDI Manager and EDI Board Sponsor for the progress that had been made and **approved** the ToRs for EDI Steering Group.

**78.** The Board reflected on the Inclusive Leadership workshop that had taken place in January and considered recommendations made by the EDI Manager for follow up action, which included the development of a Board Inclusion Framework that would help the Board to govern more inclusively and take into consideration:

- Defining a common vision for what inclusion meant to the OLC and LeO.
- How the Board could help to make the EDI Strategy an integral part of LeO's business strategy.
- How the Board could challenge the Executive and others to consider the impact of the EDI on the decisions they made.
- How the Board could embody inclusive leadership traits, hold itself, each other and the Executive to account, and develop talent and inclusive behaviours.
- How to set the tone for inclusive behaviours from the top of the organisation down and demonstrate inclusive leadership to stakeholders.

**79.** Reflecting on the development of a Board Inclusion Framework, the following suggestions were made:

- Consideration could be given to updating the Board paper header sheet to include a section highlighting the equality implications of any proposals being put forward.
- EDI should be considered when scheduling Board meetings, for example, particularly on Fridays.
- The EDI journey should not be rushed and should be taken step by step to ensure that it becomes fully embedded in the organisation.
- Having EDI policies in place was important, but of greater importance was the application of those policies.
- Encouraging participation from as wide a group as possible in the organisation would be important to ensure inclusivity.

80. Each Board member stated their personal commitment to being more inclusive.

81. Following discussion, the EDI Manager **agreed** to prepare a paper setting out suggestions for specific actions and points for the Board to consider about what it meant to be an Inclusive Board.

**ACTION: The EDI Manager to prepare a paper setting out suggestions for specific actions and points for the Board to consider about what it meant to be an Inclusive Board.**

82. The CO reported on his personal commitment to take part in reverse mentoring and advised that the Executive would be considering recommendations made by the EDI Manager on how to be more inclusive .

83. The Board **noted** the EDI update.

#### **Item 13 – Service Complaint Adjudicator Contract**

84. The Board **approved** the extension of the Service Complaint Adjudicator’s (SCA) contract for a further two years, until 31 March 2024, in line with the terms set out in the SCA contract.

#### **Item 14 – Board Paper Redactions and Non-Disclosure report**

85. The Board reviewed a paper setting out the redactions and items for non-disclosure proposed in respect of the January Board papers.

86. The Board **approved** the items identified for redaction and non-disclosure.

**ACTION: The Board Secretary to publish the January Board papers in line with the Board’s approval of the redactions and items for non-disclosure.**

#### **Item 15 – Board Effectiveness**

87. In line with the Board’s commitment to improving Board effectiveness, and in keeping with the recent training on Inclusivity, Dale Simon reflected on which Board session was the most

inclusive and why, and which Board paper was the most inclusive and why. The following key points were made :

- Overall, the OLC Board operated in a very inclusive way; the way papers are received, the respect that was shown to those presenting them and the appreciation of work that went into the preparation of the papers was never taken for granted.
- The EDI paper had been the most inclusive paper and had facilitated a helpful discussion.
- The discussion on People and Performance had demonstrated that people, and their needs, were at the heart of all that was being done to improve performance.
- Improvements could be made to the executive summaries included Board papers to ensure that any key points the Board needed to be made aware of were drawn out, instead of simply repeating information that was already included in the body of the paper.

#### **Item 16 – Any other business**

- 88.** The Board was advised that the papers for the Board workshop on 11 February would be issued on 4 February.