

Joint IPIM and Advisory Board meeting 11 May 2026: Minutes



Meeting convened via Zoom

Present (from IPIM): Lesley Evans (meeting chair), James St Ville (IPIM Chair), Gordon Harris (IPIM Treasurer), Andrea Brewster (Lead Executive Officer), Ese Akpogheneta, Robert Andrews, Alicia Chantrey, Julie Dunnett, Michael Silverleaf

Present (from the Advisory Board): Jodie Bates (Advisory Board Chair), Sally Bannan (Advisory Board Secretary), Iona Berkeley, Julie Browne, Caelia Bryn-Jacobsen, Erich Hou-Richards, Saiful Khan, Abdulmalik Lawal, Liam Lawlor, Charlene Nelson, Ellie Pilott, Megan Rannard, Anna Smith, Paul Sweeden, Sheila Wallace

Apologies: Clair Curran (IPIM Secretary); Susan Antoine, Vicki Barker, Ben Buchanan, Pete Fellows and Sherena Masharani from the Advisory Board

General

The meeting took the form of a Q&A session, with pre-circulated questions from the Advisory Board to IPIM and vice versa. Andrea Brewster took the lead on answering the Board's questions on behalf of IPIM and the IP Inclusive executive team.

Advisory Board questions for IPIM

1. What is IP Inclusive doing to address concerns around the fledgling men's group?

The working group for this is treading carefully, not rushing, organising a few events and seeing how they land before progressing to creating a full IP Inclusive community or deciding a name and remit.

The Women in IP community are closely involved and fully supportive, with a representative from their committee attending working group meetings. We will continue to monitor this as that is where key sensitivities could arise.

At the annual meeting there was considerable positive support. The first planned event has a high sign-up rate, and is more gender-balanced than many IP Inclusive events, with a higher male to female ratio than usual, which is indicative of wider support.

The group is learning from the successful men's group at the IPO, keeping an open mind and listening.

2. *On strengthening Charter and signatory engagement: what does ‘success’ look like by the end of this year?*

Success will be completing the review and using the information gained to make fully informed progress. That information will allow us to serve Charter signatories better and thus improve engagement.

The Charter review is only one element of the business plan focus on community and improving engagement. The potential communications committee and website review will also feed into this.

3. *What were the key findings of the 2025 impact survey, and how have they shaped this business plan?*

[The report of the impact survey was published last summer and can be found here.](#) The key point to emerge was the importance of IP Inclusive in building and supporting a community of people, which is why community is at the heart of the current business plan. [The Impact Report, based on the survey results, can be accessed here.](#)

4. *Are the proposed engagement metrics (social media followers, event registrants) sufficiently meaningful? These are output-level metrics. How will the organisation measure deeper outcomes, such as changes in workplace culture, retention of diverse talent, or employer behaviour?*

Social media follows and event registrations are quick wins to measure engagement, and do provide some reassurance that we are heading in the right direction.

Qualitative data comes in anecdotally. However, gathering more quantitative data is much more difficult with our limited resources.

5. *What has been the measurable impact of the previous two Summer of IP campaigns? How many participants progressed into IP careers, and what conversion data exists to justify a third campaign? What can we learn from those results? How can we retain data and monitor progress?*

Again, IP Inclusive lacks the resources to gather detailed data, and so focuses on providing opportunities. There can also be data protection difficulties in gathering suitable information. We do however have qualitative data from participants and employers that previous campaigns have been of benefit and enjoyable. There have also been a number of people who have got in touch to say they are now trainees, having got into the profession via *Summer of IP 2023* or *2024*, and they would like to give back and help with *Summer of IP 2026*.

IPIM questions for Advisory Board

1. *Are Advisory Board members seeing anything new in inclusivity, best practice or trends with a view to future events or knowledge sharing?*

Some are still sensing some pushback on EDI issues. Others felt that perhaps the level of pushback was still the same, but people had become acclimatised to a “new normal”. There has been a degree of rebranding to enable EDI initiatives to stay in place. Some reported organisations were happy for staff to attend EDI events, but not to post on social media in association with the organisation. There was also

anecdotal evidence that law firms that acquiesced to US demands had suffered as a consequence through law suits and loss of clients.

Any other business

Everyone was reminded to please provide feedback on the IP Inclusive website.

Action: - ALL to review the IP Inclusive website and send feedback on things that could be improved on upgrade; Jodie to continue to collate this input for IPIM.