

Hi, colleagues, and welcome to this session on the future of policymaking in government. I'm Jonathan Slater. I'm the Permanent Secretary at the Department for Education and just taking over from Chris Wormald as Head of the Policy Profession so let's just move on to the next slide. So that you can see that my name written up. I'm really pleased you've joined us for what I hope it's going to be a really good discussion about where we are working together on taking forward the Policy Profession. You're going to hear a bit for me, and then some from colleagues who are going to talk about their own experiences, a chance for you to ask some questions in the chat. another colleague is going to then respond on the basis of what she's heard. And then we'll wrap it up 45 minutes, hope that works for you. So just kicking off, I've been a, I've been in the world of work for about 35 years. First of all in local government and then in the last 20 years as a civil servant. If I look back on that extraordinarily long period of time that I've been at that work, what am I proudest of having achieved? What what I feel like that was really worthwhile? And I'm going to pick out two things in particular. First time about 20 years ago, when I was working on a project which was designed to improve the quality of education in schools in the north London borough. And as a result of that work, we got about twice as many children getting through five good GCSEs as before. Roll forward about 10 years later, I was working in the Ministry of Justice and I worked on a plan designed to reduce the extent to which people coming out of prison did it again and went straight back inside, to get back on the straight and narrow as quickly as possible. That was the objective. And the good news was that in the work we did, with Peterborough prison, we succeeded. When we compared the likelihood of prisoners going back when they came out, Peterborough compared with other prisons who had not been subject to the same plan. The fact was that there was more rehabilitation going on in the, in the prison that I had worked with. So I guess you can see that there's two reasons to be reasonably proud. This is not interesting, that sort of only two frankly, if you'd asked me, one of the things that I achieved, the biggest effect and why am I proud about them? Well answer because they achieved a real world outcome. They made things demonstrably better, better education, children benefiting, less crime. The prisoners themselves benefiting as as indeed, of course, were those people who were no longer victims of less crime taking place. And no surprise, that's what people say when they become civil servants. Why did you join the Civil Service answer to make a difference? To make a difference they say and so when I was talking to Michelle Dyson, the Head of the Policy Professional in the Department for Education a little while ago, what was she proud of what she was able to point out two significant things that she had achieved as the Head of the profession in the department. First of all, she'd arranged and secured 30 hours free childcare for three and four year olds, all across the country. And secondly, just very recently, she was able to secure 200,000 laptops with 50,000 routers into the hands of vulnerable children at home, during lockdown, so that their social workers could remain in contact with them. And of course, to help them with their education as well, since they didn't have access to that sort of technology. So, in a way, it's sort of obvious what the Policy Profession is, isn't it? What we want to do with the Policy Profession, it's to achieve real world outcomes, they're going to make a difference to citizens. And are going to make a positive difference at that. That's what the policy profession should be about. And whenever I talk to anybody, you know, we agree that's, that's the purpose of it. And that's what gives us satisfaction. And so the question I'm sort of interested in exploring in the next 40 minutes or so, is, well, if that's what we all want, and we sometimes do it, why don't we do it all the time? And how can we do it more of the time? What stands in the way of us focusing on you know really delivering stuff? Because when you look at the things that makes us proud and compare that with the amount of time we spend on activities, well as I say, civil servants say they come to, come into the job to make a difference for

the public. How much time do we spend with the public? For example, how much time do I spend, say, in schools and the private sector proper education compared with in ministerial offices? Because you'd expect, wouldn't you? Given what we want to do is to make a difference to the public that we'd be spending just as much time with the public understanding their needs, their expectations, their differences, as we would with ministers, but I mean, I don't know about you, but I'm not sure that's true for me. We would wouldn't we be working in teams all the time, collaborating with colleagues, whether they're local or national level, with commercial digital experts, working in joint teams to really make a difference, we'd be staying in post long enough to see the thing through interaction. And sometimes we do that, but not as much, anything like as much as we might, because the systems you know, around us the incentives, you know, often don't encourage us to operate that way. So look I was talking, for example, to somebody who was renting me a car. I was renting a car to go down to my dad's funeral at the beginning of the year. And I was chatting to the guy on the front desk about himself. He's got a business degree, he wants to move into IT in their head office at his car firm. I asked him why he's working on the front line? He said, oh, well, because the chief executive of our car rental company expects anybody who wants to work in the head office to spend a year on the front line first, really getting to know the business, really getting to understand the customers, really understanding delivery. Now, is that how the Civil Service works? Well, no, but why not? You know, in so the DfE we have a regime in which if you work on schools, you're expected to spend three days in the school a day with a child, a day with a teacher, a day with a head teacher, and that's a great thing and I've done it, and I've done the same one for early years and FE and HE but really, is that not enough? Is that enough? If, we're really motivated by achieving great outcomes for children in my case or for the citizens the whole, shouldn't we spending more time with them, really understanding their needs, really understanding the difference between them, you know, within a mile of where I'm sitting at the moment in Westminster, 100 languages spoken in schools. Compare that diversity with a diversity of the Department for Education and our understanding of the different needs of those children. And, you know, there's something found wanting or if you were to read books on, you know, blunders of governments, they're often as a consequence of us, you know, not understanding what we are trying to do from the perspective of the frontline as well as we might sometimes they say we do it really well. And I've given some examples. And you'll be hearing from Petra and Jerome about a really good example in just a minute, but often not. Even when we're trying to achieve an outcome for the public. We don't always choose the right one do we? I joined the Cabinet Office 20 years ago, there was a plan that we were working on to ensure that everybody could see their GP within 48 hours. That sounds like a real world outcome. Sounds like it's citizen focused. But if you think about it for a minute, how many people want to see their GP in 48 hours? How many people on this call would find that a useful thing? If you come in, if you get ill overnight you want to see a GP straightaway, don't you? If your daughter, your son, some other member of family gets ill, you want to see your GP today don't you? Whereas if you've got an underlying health condition, asthma, diabetes, whatever is you want to see the same GP every couple of weeks. Nobody wants to see a GP in 48 hours. Yet that was the focus of the activity that I was involved in 20 years ago. Or to take another example, a tremendous effort 10 years ago on how we might tackle illegal immigration without, as subsequently became clear, the people involved with it and understanding anything like enough about what it would be like to be on the receiving end of that. If you were perfectly legal, but you haven't got your documentation and you know, the world Windrush story broke accordingly. So that's the theme of the session today and the theme of the work that I'm doing with my colleagues right across the Policy Profession. Which sometimes we are in a situation in

which we're able to do just what we want to do, achieving great stuff on behalf of our citizens, working closely with them under political direction of course because it's a democracy and the ministers are the bosses absolutely, working in teams, achieving great stuff. But too often, that's not our reality either, either because we come up with the idea but before we have the chance to implement it we move on, or because the idea hasn't been properly tested with the public, or the we're not working sufficiently collaboratively with others. And so I hope you enjoy the rest of the session in which we explore together how we can do this as well as we possibly can, as often as we possibly can. And so at this point, I'm going to hand over to Petro and Jerome, who are going to tell you something about their own experience. And let's click on a couple of slides to get to them. Thank you.

And one more slide.

And one more slide. Sorry. That's the downside of doing this online. Thank you very much over to Pedro.

Hi, everyone, just checking that you can hear me. Actually, I can't see any feedback. So I'm assuming that you can. So I'm Pedro Wrobel my names up there on the screen. Do you want to pronounce my surname? It's Pedro. So hopefully that that'd be that. So I'm in Cabinet Office

Head of Policy Profession and the Director of Cabinet Office Systems Unit. With slight bit of feedback.

Think I'm just going to carry on, there we go. So, better at addressing the complex problems that cut across organisational boundaries. Most of you will agree that government is pretty good at dealing with issues that fall neatly into departmental responsibilities. For example, Revenue and Customs are pretty efficient at collecting tax, DWP not bad at paying out huge amounts of complex benefits and pensions. But up the chain the government is much less good at dealing with issues that fall between and across departmental boundaries. I'm sure you're going to have your own examples to illustrate it. And here's the rub. The really big challenge that we've learned today and tomorrow, if you don't respect, climate change, the best thing, but there are lots of others from homelessness to crime reduction. So let's talk about crime. I doubt that anyone will disagree with me when I say we tend to tackle issues in silos. Home Office tend to consider how to arrest criminals and disrupt network's, MOJ would think about how to sentence them. In a separate part of the flock, the Department for Education would think about disadvantaged kids. And MHCLG would think about housing. Within our department, it's same picture, policymakers will be thinking about how to craft announcements for ministers, they'll hand it over to and then they'll hand it over to their delivery partners. Often, those are basically two separate parts of the process that aren't particularly relevant to each. If your kind of responsible for the announcement, you can work out how to deliver it, neither of us really feel accountable for the ultimate outcome. In the meantime, outside of Whitehall lots of people doing fantastic, dedicated work to help reduce crime and address the causes of crime and disadvantage. Why? Why is that? It's a problem because there's nobody here who was accountable or empowered to see the big problem. Crime isn't just about arresting people, criminals don't just appear or disappear as they get arrested. And what that leads to is lots of dedicated people working really hard. But and this is the sad part, what they achieve ends up being less than the sum of its parts, less than their effort deserves because its not coherent. So the system, what ends up with, citizens doesn't get good value and neither does the taxpayer and we don't

solve the problem. Jonathan just said is what can be better? So if that's the problem, what can you do about it and we think that we need to see this all as a system. What drives people to commit criminal acts in the first place? What prevents them? Jerome's going to tell you that 81% of new crime are reoffending? So if we want to reduce crime, we need to reduce reoffending and stop people getting into that cycle in the first place. And that isn't the question just for the Ministry of Justice or the Home Office it's a question for lots of bits of government within and outside of Whitehall. This isn't new, there's lots of academic writing about systems thinking. If you walk into your, private and public sectors, do we get what we put them back? And then have a go. Right? What if, instead of sticking to our silos, all empowered one person to take a cross cutting government view? What if we brought the whole system together and tried to see it as one holistic problem and try to come up with a set of coherent actions and response? What if we focused on one clear, overarching outcome to reduce reoffending in one cohort of prisoners and use that to orientate all of our responses across the system as a whole? What if we did that? But the good news is we did try to do that. And Jerome's going to tell you precisely what happened. Thanks, Jerome.

Thanks, Pedro. So my name is Jerome Glass. I'm the Director of Prison Policy at the Ministry of Justice. And I look after, amongst other things reoffending as a kind of cross government in cross government terms. And I'm going to talk a little bit about the Prison Leaver project, which is, you know, something that we've tried to do where we try to do something a little bit different to tackle what is an old problem. I'll just give you a bit of context about the problem. So every year 70,000 people leave prison, and by and large, we fail them and by we, I mean, not just government, I think, you know, society, the country overall. Well, let me just, you know, make that a bit real for you. So, Pedro's talked about the fact that 80% of crime is is reoffending. So it's people you know, more and more crime is committed by fewer and fewer people. But it's kind of more than that. The fact that you know, one in three people who leave prison don't go into settled accommodation on their first night. And, you know, basically one in two, fifty percent of the people you see sleeping rough in the streets have left prison within a year, within the last year, and you know, and on the jobs front, you know, 80% of people who leave prison don't have a job one year after leaving prison, and that's not surprising, when you think that 50% of employers say that they wouldn't employ an ex offender anyway. So and then if you look at health outcomes and so on, I mean, the whole picture is just, you know, really quite depressing. And, and we know the sorts of things that make an enormous difference in terms of tackling reoffending. It is accommodation. It's having a job, it's employment and it's having someone who cares about you. And we quite often say it's a job, a house and a friend or it's somewhere to live, somewhere to work and someone to love. And we've tried, it's not like we haven't tried in government to tackle this before. I mean, the example that Jonathan talked about at Peterborough is a really brilliant example of a sort of what's called a social bond but a really brilliant example, trying to incentivize all the different parts of the system to work together. But generally speaking, things fail for I say, basically one of one of three reasons. The first, which is not the case in Jonathan in the, in Jonathan's case, because that worked really well. But one of them is that we don't take the whole system together. So we just try and focus on one little bit. The second is that we don't have the patience. So we try and rush things up. We try and scale things really quickly. And it's that intersection between, you know, politics and policy that's really difficult to kind of get working. And then the third, which I think really speaks to the points that Jonathan and Pedro was saying, The third reason that things fail is because we don't take into account the most important person of all, which is the citizen and in this case, the prison leaver. And one of the

interesting things about prisons, is that almost by definition, if you're working on it, if you're working on prisons, you probably haven't experienced them as a sort of as a customer for want of a better word, right. So most of us have some experience of schools or hospitals or lots of the other public services. It's not true of all public services, but a lot of the other public services, we have some experience of prisons, almost by definition, we've never really been on the receiving end of it. And so one of the things we try to do, so, as a result of that a lot of the discussion in prisons is quite technocratic. You know, it ends up being you know, it's it's very, it's analytical, but we sort of, we wrap ourselves in this kind of in, in journals, in academic studies. And, and partly also prisons are a bit grubby, and we just think oh actually, it's better to just come up with policies in Whitehall and so on. And one of the things we tried to do in this project is do something totally different. And we, you know, we really worked from the other way around, and we said, we brought the whole of the system together, so we brought not only you know, people from different departments quite often when we think, well, let's bring the whole system together, we think let's bring different departments together. But much more than that. We brought, you know, prison officers, probation officers, we brought, you know, we brought local government, we brought business, there's local businesses, we brought community leaders we brought the NHS we brought, and then, you know, we brought the voluntary sector, but also, you know, prisoners themselves, ex prisoners and their families. And we brought them all together in a room, and we tried to bring it like repeatedly, we took them to a prison, and we brought them over and over and over again, to try and create a sense of a cohort, and to try and break down some of those barriers that would naturally exist between them, you know, and after a while, you kind of leave the badge that you come in with, which says, I'm representing the Department of x. And you suddenly just begin to discuss problems as as a set of citizens actually and I have a particular perspective of things that I might be able to help fix. But I don't, my perspective is no more valid, indeed, in some cases is less valid in terms of the way that we experience the problem that many of the people that I, you know, that I was talking to, we spent a lot of time focused not on solutions, but on the problem, and what are the different contours of this problem? And how do you experience it? And that's not how I thought it was, I thought we did this, that and the other. And so that experience, which we went through towards the back end of last year, I think was just, you know, really eye opening for for us. And I think for everyone involved in it, we created this really great sense of a kind of community of people who wanted to solve a problem. Just one quick reflection and then and then what we're doing next because I think it's important to move on to, you know, any of you got questions, but one reflection is that the barriers to you know, leaving prison involves a handoff between lots and lots of different organisations, and the barriers that are thrown up by those handoffs are kind of everywhere, and you kind of don't see them when you're designing the policy. But you, when you try and go through the journey as someone experiencing all those handoffs, you just see them kind of everywhere.

And that's something that we've really tried to kind of break down. Just as a final thought in terms of where we're taking it next. So we've done that discovery phase, obviously COVID has, you know, thrown a bit of a spanner in the works in lots of ways, it makes things a little bit harder. But one of the enormous opportunities of it is it really shone a light, shone a light on just how difficult it is when people do leave prison. And so we're hoping very soon to be able to kind of wrap this work back up and to get really into the, the problem solving and designing some of those solutions.

Thanks very much for that, Jerome. Just looking at some of the questions that have come in. I'm just going to sort of summarise them. So what's the Civil Service reform mean for the future of the generalist or policy professional? So first thing to say, the work we're describing is absolutely the heart of Civil Service reform agenda, whose manifesto was laid out by Alex Chisholm yesterday. He absolutely sees this rightly, as a very significant and important part of the reform agenda. The policy work should be about delivering real world outcomes for citizens is a key element to the reform agenda. Best to try and not use the word generalist, which implies, you know, someone who doesn't know very much frankly. What we're trying to get across this session this afternoon is what we want you to think of yourself as if you're a policy professional is someone who is an expert at achieving real world outcomes for citizens, on behalf of course of ministers. You're an expert at turning an idea into action on the ground. And as one of the other questions implies, you're an expert in your subject matter. So, in my case, at the Department for Education I want people who are experts on children. I want people who are experts on how to develop skills amongst the adult population. It so happens that Michelle, as I already mentioned to the Head of my department's Policy Profession is an expert actually on children. She doesn't just work in the Department for Education. She used to work in the Ministry of Justice on youth justice, that you've just been hearing from Pedro and Jerome about. A lot of the challenges we face with vulnerable children disengaging from education are the same as those faced by the Justice board. She's worked on family policy in DWP. So a policy professional needs to be an expert in their subject matter, which might be, as I say, children, or it might be national security, or it might be the environment. And they need to be experts at delivering real world outcomes, rather than the notion that's existed in the past, and sometimes it's still the reality but we should banish it, that if you're sort of clever enough, and you sound convincing enough with ministers, you're a policy professional. No, no, you're an expert at achieving real world outcomes, and you know your subject matter. Just looking at which I hopefully helps to answer some of the other questions. Somebody asked a good one about, you know, what if you kind of come up with a plan fantastically quickly, but actually, it's, you know, you need to spend more time really. And you know, Michael Gove's speech is worth reading here at Ditchley, where, you know, he started by naming ministers as part of the problem. He describes himself very well, but I like that and he is one, that the challenge you sometimes face if a minister feels under pressure to announce something quickly, without thinking it through. So this, you know, this reform agenda requires us and ministers to work together, recognising that pressure equally. It's our job as civil servants to know about the subject matter before the minister asks us. You know, if we're spending as much time as I think we should be really understanding in my case, schools, nurseries, colleges, universities, then we will know the subject matter when the minister comes to us looking for advice. I'm going to move in a minute to look at the question about diversity particularly which I've already mentioned, once or twice. It seems, you know, it's sort of self evident, isn't it that if we are policymakers trying to achieve real worlds for citizens, all of whom are different from each other, then we need to be, have a much richer understanding of diversity and indeed be much more diverse ourselves than often we are today. Just one sort of very quick response to the question about the Civil Service itself employing ex offenders that has been an initiative led by actually the Civil Service, first Civil Service Commission and what more and so a number of departments mine included, are doing that because as you're right we need to lead by example. Okay. Let me now bring in Shahana, who's going to be talking about policymaking from her perspective. Over to you Shahana, on to the next slide please.

Hello, my name is Shahana. I work in DHSC in the Coronavirus Strategy Team. And so the topic that I'm going to be talking about today is about diversity in, diversity in Policymaking and how do we incorporate diversity into the policymaking process. Before I start, I just want to kind of go over very briefly on why it's important. I think we often kind of talk about diversity and we kind of get it, but we don't I, through this kind of session, I want to explore why it is really actually really important. And I think, as we've probably many of you, the question of diversity and policymaking has really come to the forefront because of the kind of COVID response and it has really exposed and the exaggerated the kind of inequalities that we have in our society. And particularly my it's, kind of in my community I am Bangladesh for origin and we were one of the most affected groups in society. And before I kind of move on in how we can sort of do it better and where there might be some sort of gap, to kind of talk about what we do currently, and I've been talking to a few colleagues, both at junior level, both at senior level in terms of what do we do currently in terms of trying to incorporate diversity? And the question really goes back to, I think, in most cases, back to the equalities assessment, or the piece ed, and about how that is kind of used as a way to kind of incorporate diversity. And I really want to kind of explore that a bit more about whether that is, whether we actually using that properly in Policymaking but also whether we need to go much more further. And the other kind of bit that comes across is about the consultation process about kind of getting involved and kind of involving different communities. And that also kind of, I think, goes to the heart of some of the issues that we have, which is some of the communities that we're trying to reach are probably not the communities that are going to be engaged in the policymaking profession either because they're not able to engage, or they're not actually willing to engage, and I think that is the kind of real battle that we have in the Policy Profession. So in terms of how and what we can do and to do it better and to make sure we are kind of creating policies that work for all citizens of our community, all citizens as well as all communities. And I think the first kind of fundamental one which is actually a really simple point is understanding the kind of communities we serve. And, and kind of getting better at, kind of ensuring that we have the right balance between setting policies at a national level but also allowing kind of communities to respond and implement them in a way that works for them. And so if we take, for example, the kind of recent conversations that we've been having around science, which are quite science centric or medical centric kind of conversations, and in some sense, I think there is probably a assumption that this is a worldwide problem, people understand that we are, we need to do some sort of lockdown to kind of reduce the rate of transmission. But in reality, I think there are so much more of a multi layered kind of approach that needs to be taken in terms of implementing that policy and also designing that policy. And so that my first kind of question is, are we actually having, giving space to communities to kind of talk about these kinds of issues and also empowering them to do so. And so if I take, for example, faith as a prism in terms of how you are receiving policy, the kind of conversation at faith level, and I I'm trying not to generalise too much, but I think it's not just or in terms of my faith as a Muslim, but also in terms of other faith conversation. The conversation has been around whether, you know, there is actually how much of it is understanding kind of your fate, your destiny, how much of it is, you know, taking, taking it much further and understanding risk. How kind of lockdown itself works. And so it has been, it has been a huge faith element in terms of what COVID means in terms of how much we rely on social distancing, what kind of actions we take, and the real kind of turn or the real kind of influence especially in my community has been, when those conversation has been had on a faith level, when there are actually sermons that are being delivered, which kind of goes back to kind of Islamic history in terms of how we are kind of implementing issues. And actually, what I've learned through that process myself is actually

there are actually stuff in history that we can actually take into account. So the conversation as a Muslim level has been, where has they have, has there been previous pandemic, what kind of stuff has been done there? How do we actually close mosques in those situations? Do we actually, um, how much of the mandatory kind of usual kind of conversations or what kind of rules apply in that kind of scenario and that has been the real turn, what has really turned I think the conversation in my community. So I think the fact there'll be sometimes I think, if we are not engaged with the communities, we are not going to be part of this conversation. And that conversation happens not just on, that conversation has been happening on so many levels. And it's not COVID that has kind of exploded, that conversation has been happening over organ donations, whether that is the right thing to do in terms of organ donation, and not having those engagement can make it much more harder for us to implement those kind of policies. But this has to, I think, in terms of the kind of themes in terms of making diverse policies to not also understand communities as a static kind of entity. Communities are evolving as the society around them evolves. And and there is much more that we need to do in terms of understanding intersectionality and issues that happen within community. I was part of a conversation a few weeks ago by the kind of faith networks where they were talking about, there somebody mentioned this phrase of dynamic equivalence. We sometimes it's seen that one kind of policy, for one faith actually will work the same as another. That's, that's hardly the reality. There's different ways in terms of who leads the conversation, who has influence in communities, and I think is trying to understand those. But also understanding that, once we have, once you have a stakeholder, that stakeholder is not going to always be the same stakeholder that can implement different types of policy. I mean, for example, I would I probably have wrongly assumed that I kind of understand my community much more than I do, because yesterday my brother told me that I started to sound very much like a civil servant. So I've already kind of started to notice that I'm actually not as engaged in my community as probably I assumed I could be. So that, I think there is a question in terms of understanding that communities are dynamic, it's not a static thing, we need to reach out different parts of the community at different times. And it's always ensuring that in the policymaking process that we are kind of keeping our mind open in terms of who we are reaching the community, with different parts of community and understanding that we can use, understanding the different roles that they play in society. And the other kind of response around policy, which sometimes is kind of prominent in terms of all the diverse communities, is also sometimes there is a kind of perception that loads of people have a different lead to very different ways of life, and therefore they don't lead the life that we kind of lead on. And it's also a conversation that happens when talking about diversity and especially has to happen right Black Lives Matter and also the BHD disparity report assuming that we kind of communities act in silo. And by that what I'm really trying to get out is, I think some of the conversation that's been happening around kind of language guidance, kind of guidance in different languages and the assumption that once we get languages in different kind of guidances, up on GOV.UK, that's kind of going to solve the issues around trying to reach out those communities who haven't probably seen the guidance in English, haven't been able to access guidance in English, whereas kind of completely missing out the point that like most of us, we don't actually go to GOV.UK looking for, when we have an issue, we're probably using the internet and that's probably how we're getting information. The same way we're probably getting loads of information through social media. And one of the striking things I think around the COVID pandemic, has been the lack of guidance in different languages from kind of official level yet at the same time there's been loads of conspiracy videos that have been instantly almost translated in different languages. And that is having much more of an effect in terms of

communities, community responses, in terms of what they know about the virus, but also what kind of things that they are focusing on. It's quite a lot of in terms of what kind of health advice or what kind of the solutions to COVID. And it's not understanding the kind of complex, complexity of the kind of information most people go back to the language they understand. And the kind of modes of information that they understand. And by government not under or maybe being in Whitehall, not completely understanding how people access information in different communities but actually letting, there's another kind of group that is actually filling that void. And one of the main things through that, I think are what I've understood myself is also who do we actually think is the most vulnerable in terms of kind of disinformation. One of the things that we sometimes assume is actually younger groups. But I think it is also kind of the older groups who are kind of getting those kind of information and not having kind of not being reached out. And I think that's had a huge impact in terms of communities. And that I think, more than just so I think, going back to the question of what can we do to make sure that we are creating more diverse policies and making more diverse policies is, I think is the idea that we need to make sure that we have diverse teams. Sorry is there a bit of feedback? So ensuring that we have diverse teams and diverse teams within our kind of the kind of policymaking profession that reflects their communities and has a proper understanding of the communities and that has to be at every level. What we have I think, currently in the Civil Service is that we have diversity a very low level. And what we need to do is improve that kind of diversity in teams and much more at every level to ensure that at every point where there's actually a decision that is being made, that those people are kind of, the right kind of people are leading those kinds of conversations. And mostly, I think some of the reliance sometimes at SCS level is that there are other ways to kind of get through that information. For example, reverse mentoring, which has been, you know, it is a great scheme, but at the same time, it doesn't really and especially in crisis situation, does that actually plug the gap in terms of understanding what the policy implication is. Going back to my original example in terms of accessing guidance, once a longer term response for somebody might assume just hearing that part is the kind of story you might think that oh right so the kind of policy response, a longer term policy response is making sure that there's a better English kind of language classes available to ethnic minorities. And therefore, they can kind of access information at a ready basis. But my experience is that my father, for example, speaks five languages. But when it comes to very technical guidance, he's going to go back to the language that he's most comfortable with, which is Bengali. And that is the language that he's going to feel most comfortable with. So I think what I'm trying to get at is that we need to actually have much more of a diverse, kind of diverse teams at every single kind of level to understand the kind of complexity and the multi layered kind of issues that we're facing. And then I think also in times of crisis, what I think in terms of making, putting together teams is that what we hear quite a lot from kind of SCS is that is a very, you know, pressurised environment, we need to respond very quickly. And therefore we kind of consciously or unconsciously turn to people that we are familiar with. And I think as part of that that should be also, I think there should be much more of an emphasis given to whether we're actually not just turning to the people who are familiar with who can actually deliver the policy, also turning to people who can actually provide us with the kind of more solutions not just to deliver the policy but actually make a policy that actually is properly implemented. And, and then just on I think kind of more institutional level.

Final point Shahana.

Yeah. So this is, in terms of at an institutional level, I think, think is through the Policy Profession too, is trying to make sure that we have the kind of policy kit for every kind of level of service so we're equipping up policy professionals.

Thank you very much. Sorry to stop you at that moment is just, we've only got five minutes to go and I wanted to give Lisa the chance to respond to what she's heard so far. I thought that that was a great set of challenges you laid down for us as policymakers and it certainly rings true for the DfE. If we're bringing children back to school in September, that we need to understand the particular challenges faced by say, you know, Bangladeshi families in multi generational households. Why are black Caribbean boys more, three times more likely to be excluded from school than their white counterparts? You've talked about issues of faith, there so many and the challenge's of diversity at senior levels in the DfE is a very important one, that we are making progress on but we got a long way to go. But Lisa, you've heard a great deal from Pedro and from Jerome about what they've tried to do, looking at things to the point of view of reoffending. You've heard from Shahana about how are we need to be much better at building diversity into all of our work as policymakers. You've heard something from me about my vision for more citizen centred, delivery focused Policy Profession. And you've seen some questions coming in the chat. What are your reflections. Over to the next two slides for Lisa.

Hello.

Thank you, Jonathan. So, um, as a participant and listener, I found the session really fascinating. And I think they should speak to everyone in the Civil Service who cares about how decisions are being influenced and made. So I'm just going to make a few personal comments in my capacity as what we call a working level official, and hopefully picking up some of the comments that have been made as well. So I think on the future of the Policy Profession and the systems thinking approach, I would say that or I would think that if our key role is systems oversight going forward the sort of example that Jerome has been given earlier. We might need to address a couple of questions. So first, I think how can we better encourage the end to end careers that we need to really build these experts? So we're policy officials don't mainly move between policy areas but instead they're going to be exposed to strategy, policy, delivery across the entire spectrum of the area where they work. How can we enable that? So for example, is there going to be a more prominent role in future for things like say continents were, say, as an education policy professional, I can go and spend six months with a learning provider to really understand how that world works. And also do we need to make sure that we attract more talent from those fields of work into the Civil Service so that inside feeds more naturally into policy advice. The second question that came to mind is how are we enabling our policy professionals to really maintain up to date subject expertise. So part of that could be I think learning a bit more systematically from policy failures and from policy successes in the past, including in other countries. And part of that could be having a better knowledge management system that does support officials who do move between different areas. So that doesn't get lost and people don't lose a lot of time familiarising themselves. And also I think has come up in the comments too, do we want to have more subject specific talent programmes where people can build up that expertise sort of more naturally, say in health, education, transport, etc? So those were the questions that came to my mind on the future vision of the Policy Profession. On diversity, I think we're at a really exciting turning point where we're all pulling together to achieve more diversity in the workforce and in decision making. There are already

lots of interesting things happening across government. And as someone who volunteer's a lot in the D&I space, I would love to have access to that good practice. And so I'm wondering whether there's something that maybe the centre of government can do to enable that exchange to get better. And I think my last point that I noted down, is that to me, it's kind of new vision of what the Policy Profession and the professional is going to be about and boosting diversity can really go hand in hand. I think it can really be a game changer. Because based on that vision, being a policy professional in future will be less about confident presentation and quick drafting around issues we've had limited exposure to because that's, I think, a skill that tends to come with very privileged education. And it's going to be more about building up that subject and systems expertise. Over time, and I generally think that's a path that's going to be open to more people of more diverse backgrounds. So that's it for me. Thank you.

Thank you very much, Lisa. Perfect timing. I think you've summarised it much better than I could have. I completely agree with you. That, you know, what policy professionals want to do is, is to make a difference for citizens. To do so, we can't do it unless we become more diverse and we understand our communities in a way that Shahana points out that often we don't. We can't do it unless we work in the ways that Pedro and Jerome described, looking at things from the perspective of the system, the citizen, not the department. But there is a real enthusiasm to operate in new ways. We need to find as you said, the ways in which we can help people be recruited, be trained to developed, to explore and take forward that specialism. I'm certainly recruiting more teachers and social workers into the Department of Education as you'd expect, but they're working in partnership with lots of policy professions already here. Thank you very much for everybody who's taking part in the session. I hope you've all found it interesting. And I wish you all the very best of success in your work ahead, making a difference for the public who will pay our wages. Thank you very much indeed. Goodbye.