

## Recommendations

### Appendix 3 - Table of recommendations Board Evaluation

This table shows the responses to questions (by theme) where the weighted mean score was less than 4.00 and which therefore carry the most potential for further work. In addition to the weighted mean score, the difference from the 2021 score is provided (in brackets) together with respondents' qualitative comments made in 2021 (italicised) and 2022.

<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b>	5(a)	We identify primary stakeholders and ensure that performance results are communicated effectively to them	3.67 (+0.17)	Commission stakeholder and regulated community perceptions survey, subject to scope timing and funding
	5(b)	We use feedback from stakeholders to inform our strategy and business planning	3.67 (-0.16)	
<p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>"More to do on stakeholder engagement especially with CILEX regulated community"</i></li> <li>2. <i>"I am not sure that we have managed to communicate our success (absolute and in relation to other regulators) to all stakeholders"</i></li> <li>3. On the whole I think we communicate with primary stakeholders but I wonder whether we could build on this further.</li> <li>4. I think this is an area where we probably need to spend more time.</li> <li>5. This has been particularly challenging in the current year given the announcement by CILEX and CILEX's lack of engagement with CRL on various matters.</li> </ol> <p>Extracts from Board meeting minutes 17 May 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder engagement was a challenge for many organisations and the Board had taken the opportunity to consider its axis of influence at its strategy session. CRL's successes were not particularly visible and the bolstered resource capacity within CRL was still in its early stages. The use of short videos/blogs and analytics to target and maximise various audiences was noted. A piece of work was already in progress to identify CRL's key stakeholders and develop a programme of communication, and the possibility of a meeting with the most influential people was being explored.</li> </ul>				

## Recommendations

<b>PR/External Communications</b>	11(b)	We are effective in communicating our brand to professionals within the legal services market	3.5 (-)	Commission stakeholder and regulated community perceptions survey, subject to scope, timing and funding
<u>Comments:</u>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. External communications have improved over the year. My opinion relating to communicating brand is somewhat neutral as I think this could be improved considerably. However, it is acknowledged that this has proved difficult with the ongoing dispute with CILEX due to the uncertainties of the future.</li> <li>2. External communication has improved over 2022.</li> <li>3. Not clear we have enough independent evidence on how we are perceived by regulated community or wider stakeholders.</li> </ol>				
<b>Board composition</b>	10(c)	Our portfolio structure works well	3.17 (-0.16)	Requirement to develop a shared understanding of the purpose of the portfolio structure
	10(d)	We have the right diversity composition on the Board	2.83 (0.00)	No immediate action. Diversity monitoring data about CRL staff and the people who carry out work for CRL (including the Board) was last collected and <a href="#">published</a> in July/August 2021 and is due to be renewed in 2024
<u>Comments:</u>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>"It is very hard with such a small board to get a perfect mix of diversity. Increasing the size of the Board isn't the answer though. I am not sure we have fully got the portfolio arrangements clear enough."</i></li> <li>2. <i>"We lack someone directly connected into CILEX regulated community"</i></li> <li>3. <i>"The portfolio structure is new for me, so I cannot say at this stage whether it works well."</i></li> <li>4. <i>"Portfolio has been in flux - and currently we are all pulling together and contributing to everything. We have noted the lack of BAME representation in the past - but not yet solved that issue."</i></li> <li>5. Although a portfolio structure was introduced at the beginning of the year, I think this needs further consideration. Diversity composition on board - I think we have encouraged applicants from diverse backgrounds to apply and rightly so board members are appointed dependent on the skills and experience they have and their ability to be successful at interview.</li> <li>6. We struggle to find NEDs representing some protected characteristics.</li> <li>7. Increasingly I have begun to wonder whether a larger board might be better. It works well when everyone is present but when there is an absence it is really felt. I think we need to continue to strive for better representation on the board of black / minority ethnic individuals though I know it has provided difficult.</li> <li>8. Not certain that the portfolio structure is working as well as it might, in part due to pressure of special meetings on dispute with CILEX</li> </ol>				

## Recommendations

Extracts from Board meeting minutes 17 May 2022

- Emergency business had impacted the portfolio structure and more time would be allowed for the structure to embed.
- The lack of diversity on the Board continued to be a challenge, but now was not the time to explore additional associate/observer attendees. This would be revisited in 2023.