

Extension of term for Independent Panel Members

Subject: Extension of term for Independent Panel Members (IPM)

Originator: Correspondence and Complaint Review Officer

Decision Number: 19 - 2026

Reason for Submission: For decision

Submitted to: Police and Crime Commissioner

Summary

1. This paper sets out the steps to ensure that the Eastern Region Police (Fire) and Crime Commissioners – Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk and Suffolk as well as the Ministry of Defence Police (MOD) - have an adequate list of Independent Panel Members (IPM) for the region.
2. The steps to fulfil this responsibility fall to Police (Fire) and Crime Commissioners and have been pursued on a collaborative basis by the six Offices of the Police (Fire) and Crime Commissioners within the region since 2014. The Ministry of Defence Police (MOD) entered this collaboration in January 2024.
3. It is proposed that the list of Independent Panel Members (IPM) detailed within this decision paper have their period of appointment extended to enable them to continue their roles until 1 June 2029. This paper describes the reasoning for this recommendation.

Recommendation

1. That the Police and Crime Commissioner agrees to reappoint the 10 IPMs identified in paragraph 3.2 for a further period of three years expiring 1 June 2029.

Approval by PCC

The recommendation as outlined above is approved.

Signed: Tim Passmore

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tim Passmore". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'T' and 'P'.

Signature:

Date: 18/06/2026

Detail of Submission

1. Objective

- 1.1 This report sets out the recommendation to reappoint 10 existing IPMs to the list of Independent Panel Members maintained by the Eastern Region.
- 1.2 This will enable the Eastern Region to continue to facilitate the appointment of Independent Persons for the purpose of Misconduct Hearings, Police Appeal Tribunals, Vetting Appeals and Pension Forfeiture considerations.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner is statutorily required to maintain a list of Independent Panel Members.
- 2.2 The six police and crime commissioners making up the Eastern Region maintain a joint list and have done so since 2014. The Ministry of Defence Police (MOD) entered this collaboration in January 2024.
- 2.3 In June 2024, The Police and Crime Commissioner agreed to the appointment of 18 new IPMs on a five-year term which is due to end on 1 June 2029 (see Decision Paper 18-2024).
- 2.4 In addition to this, The Police and Crime Commissioner reappointed 11 IPMs for a further two years beginning 1 June 2024 (see Decision Paper 18-2024).
- 2.5 Upon the conclusion of their two-year term, the Member Misconduct Oversight Panel (MMOP), comprising of officers from each of the offices of police and crime commissioners across the Eastern Region, have recommended that 10 of the 11 IPMs whose term ended on 1 June 2026 are reappointed for a further three years. This would bring them into line with the other IPMs.

3. Areas for Consideration

3.1 The following factors were considered when making the decision on whether to reappoint the IPMs;

- The increase in the number of Police Misconduct Hearings experienced across the region.
- The number of sittings undertaken by the IPMs within the initial two-year extension period.
- The overall experience of the Eastern Regions IPM list and the impact on the potential resilience if these IPMs were not reappointed.
- The increased roles of IPMs throughout the Eastern Region since their reappointment on 1 June 2024. This includes the use of IPMs on Police Vetting Appeal Panels, Police Appeal Tribunals and the Police Officer Pension Forfeiture process.
- Consideration of feedback received from the appropriate Professional Standards Department's (PSD) on the performance of the IPMs being considered for reappointment.
- The considerations on whether the IPMs could maintain their 'independence' if they were reappointed.
- Feedback from the 11 IPMs being considered for reappointment on whether they wished to continue with the role after the 1 June 2026.

3.2 After considerations of all the factors detailed within paragraph 3.1, it is the recommendation of MMOP that 10 of the 11 IPMs should be reappointed for a further three-year term beginning 1 June 2026. The 10 recommended for reappointment are:

- Diane Carter
- William Couves
- Peter Gratton
- Shirley Hurdle
- John Jones
- Elizabeth McEwan

- Victoria Miller
- Simon Paley
- Rebecca Stephens
- Margaret Walsh

4. Other options considered

- 4.1 It is also recommended by the Eastern Region MMOP members that all documentation issued to the 10 IPMs and detailed within Decision Paper 18-2024 will remain unchanged, apart from the end date, for this additional three-year period.
- 4.2 This recommendation is made in order to align the 10 stated IPMs with the 18 IPMs appointed in June 2024. This will enable the MMOP to review the potential reappointment of all IPMs prior to 1 June 2029.

5. Strategic aims / objective supported

- 5.1 The handling of police misconduct process has a direct impact on confidence in policing, which is fundamental to the police and crime plan. Supporting an effective and efficient misconduct process is also important to ensure the process is properly resourced and staffed.

6. Financial and other recourse implications

- 6.1 There is no change to the financial detail included within Decision Paper 18-2024. All fee and expense entitlement remains unchanged.

7. Environmental Implications

- 7.1 There are no environmental implications to consider.

8. Other implications and risks

- 8.1 It remains that IPMs do not require police vetting as per the national guidance. The Eastern Region do however undertake 'Integrity Checks' with all IPMs to ensure there has been no change in circumstances that would result in any IPM not being able to fulfil their role as an independent lay-person.

8.2 Feedback on the performance of IPMs is provided by the appropriate PSD so any performance issues or training needs identified can be actioned by the Eastern Region.

Originator Checklist (must be completed).

Please state 'yes' or 'no'

Checklist Item	Yes / No
Has legal advice been sought on this submission?	No
Has the PCC's Chief Finance Officer been consulted?	Yes
Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered, including equality analysis, as appropriate?	Yes
Have human resource implications been considered?	Yes
Is the recommendation consistent with Police and Crime Plan objectives?	Yes
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	Yes
Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media interest and how they might be managed?	Yes
Have environmental factors been considered?	Yes
In relation to the above, have all relevant issues been highlighted in the 'other implications and risks section of the submission?	Yes
Is this report a Confidential Decision?	No


If yes, please state reasons below: N/A

Approval to submit to the decision-maker

Chief Executive

I am satisfied that relevant advice has been taken into account in the preparation of the report, that the recommendation has been reviewed and that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the PCC.

Signed: Darren Horsman



Signature:

Date: 18/06/2026

Chief Finance Officer (Section 151 Officer)

I certify that:

- a) there are no financial consequences as a result of this decision,
Or
- b) the costs identified in this report can be met from existing revenue or capital budgets,
Or
- c) the costs identified in this report can be financed from reserves
And
- d) the decision can be taken on the basis of my assurance that Financial Regulations have been complied with.

Signed: Colette Batson



Signature:

Date: 18/06/2026

Public access to information: Information contained within this submission is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and wherever possible will be made available on the OPCC website. Submissions should be labelled as 'Not Protectively Marked' unless any of the material is 'restricted' or 'confidential'. Where information contained within the submission is 'restricted' or 'confidential' it should be highlighted, along with the reason why.