



Prison Service Pay Review Body

Seventh Report
on
Northern Ireland
2011

Chair: Jerry Cope



Prison Service Pay Review Body

Seventh Report

on

Northern Ireland

2011

Chair: Jerry Cope

**Presented to the
Minister of Justice (Northern Ireland)
2011**

© Crown copyright 2011

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Office of Manpower Economics,

Victoria House,

Southampton Row,

London WC1B 4AD

or online

<http://www.ome.uk.com/Enquiry/Default.aspx>

This publication is also available on

<http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/>

ISBN: 9780108510427

Printed in the UK by The Stationery Office Limited
on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

ID P002420326 03/11

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

The current membership of the
Prison Service Pay Review Body

is

Jerry Cope (*Chair*)
Professor John Beath
Dr. Henrietta Campbell CB
Richard Childs QPM
Bronwen Curtis CBE
John Davies OBE
Joe Magee

The secretariat is provided by the
Office of Manpower Economics

Contents

	Paragraph	Page
<i>Glossary of terms</i>		<i>vi</i>
<i>Northern Ireland Prison Service and our remit group</i>		<i>vii</i>
<i>Summary</i>		<i>viii</i>
Chapter 1: Introduction		1
Our role and terms of reference	1.1	1
Outcome of our last report	1.3	1
Remit letter	1.5	1
Our approach to this round	1.7	2
Evidence base	1.9	2
Written and oral evidence	1.10	2
Visits to prison establishments	1.12	2
Our report	1.13	2
Chapter 2: Context and evidence		3
Context	2.1	3
Public sector pay policy – impact on the remit group	2.9	4
Economic context	2.12	4
Evidence	2.16	6
Affordability	2.21	6
Recruitment and retention	2.23	6
Morale and motivation	2.25	7
Basic pay award	2.27	7
Other issues	2.30	7

Chapter 3:	Our recommendations on pay for 2011		9
	Introduction	3.1	9
	Recommendations – basic pay	3.6	9
	Night patrol officers	3.10	10
	Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Service	3.15	11
	Cost of recommendations	3.28	12
Chapter 4:	Looking ahead		13
	Introduction	4.1	13
	Comments on matters affecting staff in the wider remit group	4.2	13
	The need for long-term reform	4.8	13
Appendices			
	A: Standing terms of reference		15
	B: Remit letter from the Minister of Justice, Northern Ireland		16
	C: PSPRB reply to the Minister of Justice, Northern Ireland		18
	D: Current and recommended pay levels for 1 April 2011		19
	E: Current and recommended allowances		23

Glossary of terms

ASHE	Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings
CJINI	Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland
CPI	consumer prices index
GDP	gross domestic product
HMCIP	Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons
MGO	main grade officer
MLA	Member of the Legislative Assembly (Northern Ireland)
NCO	night custody officer
NHS	National Health Service
NIPS	Northern Ireland Prison Service
OBR	Office for Budget Responsibility
OME	Office of Manpower Economics
ONS	Office for National Statistics
OSG	operational support grade
PECCS	Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Service
PGA	Prison Governors Association
PCO	prisoner custody officer
PO	principal officer
POA	The Professional Trades Union for Prison, Correctional and Secure Psychiatric Workers
PSNI	Police Service Northern Ireland
PSPRB	Prison Service Pay Review Body
RPI	retail prices index
SO	senior officer
SPCO	senior prisoner custody officer
TSL	Target Staffing Level

The Prison Service in Northern Ireland and our remit group

The Northern Ireland Prison Service, through its staff, aims to serve the community by keeping in secure, safe and humane custody those committed by the courts, and by working with prisoners and with other organisations, seeks to reduce the risk of re-offending; and in so doing protect the public and contribute to peace and stability in Northern Ireland.

It has a vision to be recognised as a model of good practice in dealing with prisoners and to be valued and respected for its service to the community.

It has three operational establishments – one of which accommodates male young offenders and female prisoners.

It had a prison population on 17 January 2011 of 1,477.

It had staff costs of some £90 million in 2009-10, of which £76 million related to the paybill for our remit group.

The composition of our remit group is shown below.

Our remit group in Northern Ireland as at 31 August 2010

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Staff in post¹</i>	<i>%</i>
Governor grades	38	2.1
Officer grades ²	1,276	69.8
Support and other grades ³	514	28.1
Total⁴	1,827	100.0

¹ Full-time equivalents

² Includes main grade officers, senior officers and principal officers

³ Includes auxiliaries, night patrol officers, night custody officers, prisoner custody officers, senior prisoner custody officers, officer support grades and healthcare assistants

⁴ Figures have been rounded to the nearest final digit, the constituent items may not add up exactly to the total

Source: Northern Ireland Prison Service

Prison Service Pay Review Body 2011 Report on Northern Ireland: Summary

Our key recommendations to apply from 1 April 2011 are:

- A consolidated increase of £250 for night custody officers, operational support grades and healthcare assistants;
- A consolidated increase of £0.12 per hour for prisoner custody officers and senior prisoner custody officers;
- That night patrol officers be paid at a single rate of £18,704.

In the light of the exceptional economic circumstances, the Minister asked us to make recommendations only for those in the remit group earning £21,000 or less, following the Government's announcement of a two-year pay freeze for those earning above that threshold. Against this background, we invited the parties to focus their evidence on these groups, but also sought background information to help us keep in touch with the recruitment, retention and motivation of the full remit group, for whom we expect to make recommendations again following the pay freeze.

We were pleased to receive submissions from the Northern Ireland Prison Service, the POA and the PGA and heard oral evidence from them and from David Ford, the Minister of Justice, in Belfast in November 2010. We also heard the views of many staff during our visits last summer which took in all three prison establishments and those in the Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Service (PECCS) group based at Laganside Court and Newtownards.

Context and evidence

Our report sets out the context and evidence in Chapter 2. We were mindful of the wider changes impacting on the Service and its workforce, ranging from the devolution of policing and justice and the associated commissioning of a major review of its management led by Dame Anne Owers, to the continuing concerns about the security situation. The Government's evidence stressed the challenging context of the public finances, as a consequence of which the Justice Department and NIPS needed to achieve significant reductions in resource expenditure during the Spending Review period. It also noted that in the wider labour market context the earnings of prison service staff compared well with those available elsewhere. The POA emphasised the impact on its members of cost of living increases, and proposed an award of 4 per cent for those earning £21,000 or under. The PGA acknowledged the application of the pay freeze and did not submit a basic pay proposal.

Our recommendations on pay for 2011

We set out our recommendations in Chapter 3. On the basic pay award for those not covered by the pay freeze, we noted that there was no recruitment or retention evidence to support a significant pay uplift, and the main rationale for the proposed uplift of £250 was to ensure fairness for low paid workers who would be harder hit by any reduction in real wages. Given that the policy, as articulated by the Northern Ireland Executive, was to apply the uplift across the public sector as a whole there was also a general expectation of a £250 uplift and we judged it would have a negative impact on morale and motivation if it were not matched. Accordingly we recommend a £250 uplift for all staff earning £21,000 or under, except for

night patrol officers, where we recommend a single pay rate of £18,704 which provides at least £250 for those concerned.

We considered carefully some detailed proposals from the POA on staff working in PECCS, having heard clearly on our visits that staff have concerns about their working patterns, including the lack of choice on, and unpredictability of, overtime working. On overtime, we noted their proposal that this should be paid at an enhanced rate, but do not think we have sufficient evidence to recommend a change. However we wish to see more detailed evidence next year on the patterns of overtime working and the impact on particular groups and suggest there may be advantage in the Service considering a different reward package which both supports service delivery and rewards the nature of the job. We did not support the POA proposal for a standard working week of 39 hours as we believe the variety of options currently available provide both staff and the Service with valuable flexibility. Nor do we think the case has been made on recruitment or retention grounds for a driver allowance.

The cost of our recommendations add £160,000 to the total paybill.

Looking ahead

Looking ahead in Chapter 4 we ask the Service to consider matters impacting on the wider remit group, specifically whether a different model of healthcare provision would meet the need to recruit and retain staff with the right skills and experience; and proposals for reform of the governor grades pay scales. More widely, we welcome the wish of the parties to make progress on a long-term reform agenda and consider that an innovative pay and reward package could play an important role in driving cultural change. We believe that a funded redundancy programme is needed to facilitate such change and enable efficiencies through a more appropriate mix of officer and support grades.



Chapter 1: Introduction

- Our role and terms of reference**
- 1.1 This is our seventh report as an independent Pay Review Body for Prison Service staff within our remit in Northern Ireland, and the first in which we make recommendations to its devolved administration. We report separately for England and Wales. Our remit does not apply to Scotland where separate pay negotiating arrangements apply.
- 1.2 Our core task under our standing terms of reference, reproduced at Appendix A, is to recommend rates of pay that are fair and appropriate in the light of the evidence presented to us, taking account of any directions that may be contained in the annual remit letter from the Minister of Justice.
- Outcome of our last report¹**
- 1.3 In our 2010 report we recommended:
- A consolidated basic pay award for all grades of 1.0 per cent from 1 April 2010;
 - A 12-point scale for governor 5s, achieved by removing intermediate points from the existing 24-point scale;
 - The introduction of a Qualified Nurse Premium Payment of £2,500 per annum as a temporary market supplement, to be pensionable and apply only to nurse officers, senior and principal nurse officers on the post-2002 scales; and
 - All specialist and other allowances remain at their current level.
- 1.4 That report was submitted to the Northern Ireland Office in early 2010 and our recommendations were accepted and implemented in full.
- Remit letter**
- 1.5 Responsibility for the Northern Ireland Prison Service was devolved to the Department of Justice, a new Northern Ireland Department, on 12 April 2010. We received a remit letter for this report from David Ford MLA, Minister of Justice on 22 September 2010 (Appendix B). In it, the Minister said that:
- The pay freeze for all public sector workers (except for full-time equivalents earning £21,000 or less per year), announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Budget on 22 June 2010, would apply to staff groups subject to the Northern Ireland Executive's pay policy, which included staff in the Northern Ireland Prison Service;
 - He would submit evidence for employees earning a full-time equivalent of £21,000 or less, but would not submit evidence or seek recommendations on a pay uplift for those groups earning more than £21,000; and
 - He valued our role in bringing an independent and expert view and making evidence-based pay recommendations, and that role would continue following the pay freeze.
- 1.6 The letter also confirmed that work to improve the efficiency and the effectiveness of the Service was being carried forward under the Strategic Efficiency and Effectiveness Programme. The programme involves a fundamental review of the operating model of each prison which may impact on staff numbers and on wider terms and conditions for personnel. It will take forward recommendations from the Owers Review currently underway. We have in previous reports encouraged the parties to work together to achieve reform and will

¹ Previous reports are published on the website of the Office of Manpower Economics: www.ome.uk.com

follow with interest their progress in the coming year. We comment further on this in Chapter 4.

Our approach to this round

1.7 We considered carefully our approach to the round in the light of the Minister's letter. It is most unusual for our remit to be restricted in this way and we wished to ensure that in conducting this round we maintained confidence in the process and in the Review Body's independence. We noted the exceptional economic circumstances, and the policy that a pay freeze should apply across the public sector to those earning over £21,000. Against this background we invited the parties to focus their evidence on those groups within the remit earning £21,000 or less (including night custody officers who earn just over this amount but for a 44 hour week). We also invited them to submit background information on the recruitment, retention and motivation of the remit group as a whole to help us understand the context for our recommendations and leave us better placed to make recommendations for the full remit group in future rounds.

1.8 Our reply of 5 October 2010 to the remit letter, copied to other parties, set out this approach (reproduced at Appendix C). It indicated that we might wish to comment, but without making formal recommendations, on issues to which we believe the Service should give attention in the interim before the pay freeze comes to an end. We do so in Chapter 4.

Evidence base

1.9 Our recommendations are based on our independent judgement of the evidence available to us. This includes written and oral submissions made to us by the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS) and the staff associations and trade unions and the information received from our visits to prison establishments.

Written and oral evidence

1.10 Having received our remit letter of 22 September 2010 for this review, we requested and received written submissions in response from the interested parties in late October.

1.11 We heard oral evidence, in Belfast, on 18 November, from David Ford MLA, Minister of Justice and Robin Masefield, the then Director General of the Northern Ireland Prison Service with other officials of NIPS. We also met separately representatives of the Prison Governors Association (PGA), Pat Maguire and Dennis Chirgwin, and the POA, Bryan McMullan and June Robinson.

Visits to prison establishments

1.12 In June we were able to visit Maghaberry, Magilligan and Hydebank Wood and also to meet staff serving in the Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Service (PECCS) at Laganside Court. In September one of our members also spent a day visiting the PECCS team at Newtownards. These visits are an important aspect of our programme, allowing us to meet remit group members at work and also to meet their representatives in the POA and PGA. We were very glad this year to have these opportunities to gain a better understanding of the work of the PECCS group. In relation to all the visits, we take this opportunity to thank all those involved in making them a success, whether as an organiser, participant in discussion groups, a guide on a tour or as someone we spoke to as we moved around the establishment.

Our report

1.13 In Chapter 2 we set out the context in which we have conducted this round, and summarise the main points made by the parties in their evidence. In Chapter 3 we make our recommendations on pay for 2011 and in Chapter 4 we comment on some wider issues which have featured in our evidence and to which we believe the Service could usefully give attention in the coming year.

1.14 Our secretariat is provided by the Office of Manpower Economics.

Chapter 2: Context and evidence

Context 2.1 We conducted this round against the backdrop of considerable change and challenge in the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS). The context for our work in Northern Ireland altered significantly with the devolution of policing and justice, and the associated commissioning of a major review of the management of prisons led by Dame Anne Owers. Her recommendations will help shape major change through the Strategic Efficiency and Effectiveness Programme. NIPS also faced continuing challenges in relation to the security environment. More broadly, the economic environment and pressure on the public finances across the UK influenced the Government evidence to us with the announcement of a public sector pay freeze and the outcome of the Spending Review. We comment briefly below on these developments, and the main points made in evidence from the parties, before turning to our recommendations in Chapter 3.

Devolution

2.2 On 12 April 2010 powers relating to policing and justice were devolved from Westminster to the Northern Ireland Assembly. This included responsibility for NIPS. This means for the first time our report is submitted to the Minister of Justice of the Northern Ireland Executive, instead of to the Westminster Government.

Owers Review

2.3 As part of the agreement on devolution, NIPS was committed to ‘keep the management of prisons under review to ensure that conditions of detention, management, and oversight are appropriate and custody is a safe environment for vulnerable people’.

2.4 An independent review team, led by Dame Anne Owers (formerly HM Chief Inspector of Prisons), was formed in June 2010. Its work was planned to consist of several stages. The first stage included a review of the regime at Maghaberry to be available early in 2011. The second stage was to look at issues specific to Magilligan, issues specific to Hydebank Wood, and wider issues affecting the future development of NIPS. The review team was required to take account of the views of stakeholders including prison management, staff, trades unions, prisoner fora, other prisoner representative groups and the Northern Ireland Assembly Justice Committee.

2.5 The review will also take account of evidence from the Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland (CJINI) report, published on 14 December 2010, on corporate governance arrangements within NIPS. This notes the failure to deliver better outcomes for prisoners in terms of time out of cell, access to work, education and other purposeful activity, despite staffing levels two and a half times greater than in comparable prisons in England and Wales. It comments on the poor state of industrial relations and the need for significant development in this area if fundamental reform is to be achieved.

Strategic Efficiency and Effectiveness Programme

2.6 The Minister referred in his remit letter to continuing work on workforce reform, now brigaded under the wider Strategic Efficiency and Effectiveness Programme. This will involve a fundamental review of the operating model of each of the prisons and will impact on the number of staff and the manner of their deployment. It aims over a three-year period to deliver the fundamental change needed to respond to political expectations, including for improved outcomes for offenders, and to achieve the efficiencies needed following the Spending Review. The Programme aims to deliver a range of reforms including those recommendations expected from Dame Anne Owers’ review.

Security concerns

2.7 It was clear from discussions during our visits, and wider evidence, that the security situation continues to be a concern for those who work in the Service, and that issues arising from separation of prisoners continue to make heavy demands on Service management and officers. Following a protest by Republican prisoners at Maghaberry about prison conditions an agreement was reached in August 2010 which included development of a prisoner forum, enhancements to association arrangements for separated prisoners and revised search policies and procedures.

2.8 Police Service Northern Ireland (PSNI) information suggests Dissident Republicans may be considering an attack on unnamed prison officers and the Security Service rates the threat of an attack against prison officers as 'a strong possibility'. PSNI served 34 threat notices on prison officers in the first ten months of 2010, compared with 13 in 2009 and 2 in 2008.

Public sector pay policy – impact on the remit group

2.9 On 22 June 2010 the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced a two-year pay freeze for all public sector workforces, with the exception of those earning a full-time equivalent salary of £21,000 a year or less. This policy also applies to Northern Ireland staff groups subject to the Northern Ireland Executive's pay policy. The Northern Ireland Department of Finance and Personnel indicated that the pay freeze represents a total freeze on all pay elements unless there was a contractual entitlement to an increase. They also said that those on lower earnings should receive a consolidated pay increase of at least £250 with the lowest paid possibly having a more generous award.

2.10 This means we have been asked to make recommendations on a narrower range of staff than usual. All governors, officer grades and auxiliaries earn more than a full-time equivalent salary of £21,000 a year and are therefore outside the scope of our remit this year. However NIPS have confirmed that there is a contractual entitlement to pay progression for staff in NIPS where appropriate. Those groups covered by the remit this year are night custody officers, night patrol officers, senior prisoner custody officers, prisoner custody officers, healthcare assistants and operational support grades. At 31 August 2010, NIPS had 1,830 staff in post, of whom just over 500, with basic consolidated pay of around £9½ million, are in those groups for whom we make recommendations in this report.

Spending Review

2.11 The outcome of the UK Spending Review was announced in Westminster on 20 October 2010. The settlement for Northern Ireland, as set out in the draft budget for 2011-15, by Sammy Wilson MLA, Minister for Finance and Personnel, on 15 December 2010 was for a real terms reduction in resource expenditure of 8 per cent and a real terms reduction in capital expenditure of 40 per cent. Figures for the Department of Justice show an actual cash reduction in resource expenditure of 4.7 per cent and capital expenditure of 35 per cent in the three years to 2013-14.

Economic context

2.12 The 2010 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) showed that in Northern Ireland:

- Median full-time earnings at April 2010 were £23,000, 0.8 per cent higher than a year earlier. This was a lower rate of increase than observed across the UK as a whole (2.1 per cent), where full-time median earnings were £26,000;
- The annual salary of operational support grades (OSGs) was 15 per cent below median full-time earnings in Northern Ireland at April 2010. This compares with the maximum point on the OSG pay scale in England and Wales which is 30 per cent below median full-time earnings in England and Wales.

2.13 Average Weekly Earnings², for Great Britain only, including bonuses, increased by 2.1 per cent in the three months to November 2010, compared with the same period a year earlier. Private sector earnings rose by 1.9 per cent, compared with growth of 2.4 per cent in the public sector. The median of independent forecasts is for average weekly earnings growth of 2.3 per cent across the economy as a whole in 2010 (in line with the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) forecast of 2.3 per cent) and 2.6 per cent in 2011 (OBR forecast 2.2 per cent).

2.14 Consumer prices data published by the Office for National Statistics cover the whole of the UK but do not separately identify price levels or changes in Northern Ireland. From September 2009 consumer prices index (CPI) inflation rose from 1.1 per cent, peaking at 3.7 per cent in April 2010. Since then CPI inflation had fallen back but was again 3.7 per cent in December 2010, with a further rise expected in January 2011 following an increase in VAT. Inflation as measured by the retail prices index (RPI) followed a similar pattern to CPI, rising from a trough in June 2009, at minus 1.6 per cent, to 5.3 per cent in April 2010, with the latest data showing a 4.8 per cent increase in the year to December 2010. The median of independent forecasts for the final quarter of 2011 is for CPI to be at 2.9 per cent and RPI to be at 4.0 per cent. These compare with the OBR forecasts³ made in November for CPI to be at 2.8 per cent and RPI to be at 3.4 per cent.

2.15 The latest data for Northern Ireland showed that in the three months to November 2010:

- Employment was 768,000, two thousand higher than a year earlier but twelve thousand lower than three months earlier;
- The employment rate was 65.3 per cent (of those aged 16-64), 0.1 percentage points lower than a year earlier and 1.1 percentage points lower than three months earlier;
- Unemployment was 65,000, ten thousand higher than a year earlier and seven thousand higher than three months earlier; and
- The unemployment rate was 7.8 per cent (of those aged 16-64), 1.1 percentage points higher than a year earlier and 0.9 percentage points higher than three months earlier.

Data for the UK showed that in the three months to November 2010:

- Employment was 29.09 million, 184,000 higher than a year earlier but 69,000 lower than three months earlier;
- The employment rate was 70.4 per cent (of those aged 16-64), 0.1 percentage points lower than a year earlier and 0.3 percentage points lower than three months earlier;
- Unemployment was 2.50 million, 38,000 higher than a year earlier and 49,000 higher than three months earlier; and
- The unemployment rate was 7.9 per cent (of those aged 16-64), 0.1 percentage points higher than a year earlier and 0.2 percentage points higher than three months earlier.

² The data published each month by the ONS (Office for National Statistics) are for Great Britain only and do not include Northern Ireland.

³ Office for Budget Responsibility published its *Economic and Fiscal Outlook* on 29 November 2010

Evidence 2.16 As we said in Chapter 1, we considered carefully how we should approach this round given our unusually constrained remit and the importance of maintaining confidence in the review body process and in our independence. We decided to ask for evidence focussing on those groups covered by this remit, but also invited the parties to supply wider background information to help us keep in touch with recruitment, retention and motivation issues affecting the wider remit group.

2.17 We set out below the main evidence from the Service on the overall economic position, affordability and the staffing issues, followed by the main proposals on pay made by each of the parties.

Government economic evidence

2.18 This year, again, the Government economic evidence focused on the UK as a whole, offering little or no evidence specific to Northern Ireland. We ask NIPS, once more, to ensure that this deficiency is corrected ahead of the next round.

2.19 The Government evidence highlighted the fact that the overall UK budget deficit had reached 11 per cent of GDP in 2009-10. Its current aim is to achieve cyclically-adjusted balance by the end of 2015-16. The Government's focus is on reducing public spending rather than increasing taxation, and the £3.3 billion saving from a two-year public sector pay freeze forms part of £81 billion of savings required by 2014-15. The Government estimates that in 2009-10 pay represented about 50 per cent of departmental spending allocations and as such the management of public sector pay is a key element of deficit reduction. The Government believes that, at a time when demand for public services is rising, pay restraint will be crucial if service quality is to be maintained.

2.20 The one aspect of Government economic evidence that did relate to Northern Ireland was an analysis of the 2009 ASHE data. This evidence showed that in 2009 although average public sector earnings in Northern Ireland were below the UK average they were above that for Wales, each of the northern English regions and the West Midlands. Also, the differential between the public and private sectors is 28 per cent in favour of the public sector in Northern Ireland and 4 per cent in the UK as a whole.

Affordability 2.21 At the time of submitting written evidence NIPS was not then in a position to know its own Spending Review settlement. However, in oral evidence it said that affordability was a big challenge and they expected to have to take out 5 per cent per annum from the budget, a real terms reduction of £60 million over the next four years.

2.22 Between 2006-07 and 2009-10 NIPS has reduced the cost per prisoner place from £90,300 to £77,800 and has a specific value for money target to further reduce cost per prisoner place to £76,500 by 2010-11. Staff costs are a key factor, accounting for 65 per cent of net operating costs in 2009-10.

Recruitment and retention 2.23 At 31 August 2010 there were 513 staff in the support grades against a target of 677, with the deficit almost entirely at operational support grades (OSGs). Since 2008, NIPS recruitment effort has focused mainly on OSGs and we heard no evidence to suggest NIPS is unable to recruit good quality OSGs. The continuing deficit is linked to the slow rate at which main grade officers leave the Service, so leaving limited scope for recruitment within budget. Excluding officer and governor grades, retention remains high, 19 people left the Service in 2009-10, and just 6 in the first five months of 2010-11.

2.24 Most overtime payments are made to staff in the officer grades. Nevertheless there is significant use of overtime by staff in the Prisoner Escorting and Court Custody Service (PECCS) group. In 2009-10 payments worth £195,000 were made to staff in PECCS, a significant amount, though down compared with £240,000 in 2008-09 and £280,000 in 2007-08. At officer level payments were almost £1 million in 2009-10, down from over £3½ million in each of the previous two years.

Morale and motivation

2.25 NIPS continued to meet most of its key targets, meeting 9 of its 11 Key Performance Indicators in 2009-10. The missed targets related to the number of training days received by staff and failure to reduce absenteeism to 11 days per head per annum. The POA said that if the Service was to retain its staff it would have to show it valued staff through their pay award.

2.26 In 2009-10 the average number of days lost through absence fell to 12.6 from 14.6 in 2008-09, with reductions across all grades. The Service has a target to further reduce absence to an average of 11 days by the end of 2010-11.

Basic pay award

2.27 Consistent with the approach to pay set out in the Minister's remit letter, the Service evidence sought recommendations only for those groups earning £21,000 or less. NIPS made the following specific proposals:

- An increase in basic pay of £250 for night custody officers (NCOs), operational support grades (OSGs) and healthcare assistants;
- An increase in the hourly rate for prisoner custody officers (PCOs) and senior prisoner custody officers (SPCOs) of 12 pence, equivalent to an annual increase of £250 for those working full-time; and
- Move to a single pay point for night patrol officers (NPOs), at a level £250 higher than the existing scale maximum.

2.28 The POA proposed a basic award of 4 per cent for NCOs, OSGs, PCOs, SPCOs, NPOs and healthcare assistants, to take account of changes to the cost of living over the past two years.

2.29 The PGA acknowledged that the public sector pay freeze policy applied by the Northern Ireland Executive applied to its members and did not submit a basic pay proposal.

Other issues

2.30 NIPS also proposed simplifying the pay of night patrol officers by putting them on a spot rate. They argued this would correct an anomaly and minimise the risk of equal pay challenge, at minimal cost.

2.31 In the POA evidence we were asked to consider, in addition to the basic award, a number of detailed issues relating to the PECCS group:

- A move to a standard 39 hour week instead of the current option of contracts at 20, 35 or 40 hours;
- Payment of overtime at time and a half instead of the current standard rate; and
- A new drivers' allowance linked to the need to maintain a vehicle and the expected introduction of an EU requirement for drivers of public service vehicles.

2.32 Our analysis and recommendations on these proposals are set out in Chapter 3.

2.33 In its evidence the PGA welcomed the changes made to compress the Governor 5 scale in response to our recommendations last year. In the wider context, they noted the pressures that managers would face as a result of the Spending Review and changes expected as a result of the Strategic Efficiency and Effectiveness Programme, and commented that governor grades (in common with many other public service managers) would be adversely affected by the pay freeze. They also expressed concern about the Service's intentions relating to the remuneration package for the appointment of a governing governor at Maghaberry.

Chapter 3: Our recommendations on pay for 2011

Introduction 3.1 Our terms of reference require us to take account of evidence in a number of areas, including: recruitment, retention, motivation, local labour market conditions, legal obligations on the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS), and affordability.

3.2 The application, this year, of a pay freeze for public sector workforces earning more than £21,000 a year means that our recommendation on basic pay does not apply to governors, prison officer grades and auxiliaries.

3.3 The Spending Review settlement for the Department of Justice is likely to leave NIPS with a reduced budget, in cash terms, at a time when the prisoner population is expected to grow by 10 per cent over the next four years. NIPS expect to have to take out 5 per cent per annum from the budget, a real terms reduction of £60 million over the next four years. The majority of staff will see no increase in their pay, because of the pay freeze, and fewer than forty personnel will gain from incremental progression. However, any recommendation we make for those earning £21,000 or less will be a modest addition to the paybill.

3.4 The staffing data show there is a large deficit of operational support grades (OSGs) against target but this does not reflect an inability on the part of NIPS to recruit and retain personnel at this grade. Outflow for all grades remains low and recruitment of OSGs is constrained by the slow rate at which main grade officers, whose numbers exceed target, leave the Service. Staffing levels for other grades covered by our recommendation are relatively well matched against target levels where outflow levels are also low.

3.5 As set out in Chapter 2 the latest data show a weakening in general labour market conditions with employment falling and unemployment rising over the latest three months and a gap between public sector and private sector earnings that remains greater than in the UK as a whole.

Recommendations *Recommendations on pay increases for those earning £21,000 or under* – basic pay

3.6 The Government evidence sought a consolidated increase of £250. This was consistent with the budget statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer which had announced an uplift of 'at least' £250 for those under the pay freeze threshold. However, NIPS considered this was the maximum that could be afforded in view of the budget constraints facing them. The evidence base behind the figure of £250 (1.2 per cent for someone earning £21,000) appears limited, and the rationale to be that of protection for those on low pay, rather than linked to recruitment and retention. We note also that the evidence available to us on recruitment and retention, the need to make financial savings over the Spending Review period as well as the latest labour market data all point towards a low award.

3.7 While these indicators could be argued to provide no case for an uplift, we recognise that when the broader issue of fairness to low-paid workers is considered, there is a case for a modest uplift. In view of what has been happening to prices, a pay freeze would significantly reduce the real wages of low-paid workers and hit them particularly hard. Moreover, prison staff need to be considered in the context of the rest of the public sector in Northern Ireland and since the £250 baseline is being generally applied there, this has created a general expectation amongst staff which, were it not to be matched, would have a significant negative impact on morale and motivation.

3.8 The POA proposed an increase of 4 per cent to take account of changes to the cost of living over the past two years. Although we take account of cost of living increases, as they

impact on recruitment, retention, motivation and morale we do not make recommendations that simply track price increases.

3.9 Taking all of these points into account we recommend a £250 consolidated increase to all annual pay scales and an increase in hourly rates equivalent to an annual increase of £250.

Recommendation 1: We recommend a consolidated increase of £250 for night custody officers, operational support grades and healthcare assistants. The effect of this recommendation is set out at Appendix D.

Recommendation 2: We recommend a consolidated increase of £0.12 per hour for prisoner custody officers and senior prisoner custody officers. The effect of this recommendation is set out at Appendix D.

Night patrol officers

3.10 NIPS proposed replacing the existing night patrol officer pay spine with a single pay point, £250 higher than the existing scale maximum.

3.11 Currently night patrol officers are paid on a pay spine, with 30 points between the minimum of £15,969 and the maximum of £18,454. This is a closed grade to which staff are no longer recruited. There are five staff members in this group who have all been in the service and grade for more than 10 years. However, some are paid at the maximum of the scale, with others on one of the two points immediately below the maximum. There is no automatic pay progression system for this group which means that the only way for their pay to increase is through the implementation of the Review Body's annual recommendations. However, because the pay spine maximum is usually increased in line with any award, the position of any one member of staff relative to other night patrol officers remains unaltered. If the current arrangement continues then those staff members paid below the scale maximum will never reach the scale maximum. The Service considers this unfair. It also means that they are exposed to some risk of a claim under equal pay legislation. To rectify this situation the Service has proposed a new single night patrol officer pay point of £18,704, to replace the existing night patrol officer pay spine.

3.12 Other support grades, such as operational support grades, night custody officers and prisoner custody officers are already paid a single rate. The proposal from NIPS is for a single pay point £250 higher than the existing scale maximum of £18,454. This will result in a small number of staff receiving increases of £433 and £342, in addition to those already on the scale maximum receiving an increase of £250. The overall cost of the proposal is just over £2,000 with the additional cost due to standardising on a single pay point less than £1,000.

3.13 Although the POA did not comment on the NIPS proposal in its written evidence, when questioned in oral evidence, it welcomed the proposal to pay night patrol officers on a single pay point.

3.14 We support the proposal from NIPS. This change would simplify the pay system by replacing a 30-point pay spine, for five staff members, with a single pay point, in line with the pay arrangements for other support grades. We had commented previously to the Service that such a simplification to produce a spot rate would be useful. We considered carefully whether it would be appropriate to recommend an increase of more than £250 to effect the simplification during a period of pay freeze, when there was no obvious recruitment and retention justification. However, we believe on balance it is justifiable to remove an

anomaly affecting a small group on low pay and so minimise the risk of an equal pay claim, at very low cost.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that night patrol officers be paid £18,704, at a single rate.

**Prisoner
Escorting and
Court Custody
Service
(PECCS)**

3.15 The POA made a number of proposals relating to staff working in the PECCS. It proposed that prisoner custody officers (PCOs) and senior prisoner custody officers (SPCOs) all work a standard 39 hour week, with any overtime paid at a rate of time and a half. It also proposed that those responsible for driving escort vehicles should receive an allowance over their basic salary.

The working week/overtime

3.16 At the moment PCOs and SPCOs have a standard working week of either 20, 35, or 40 hours a week. In the year to 31 August 2010, 130 PCOs had worked 20,000 hours of overtime (an average of three hours per week) and 12 SPCOs a total of 600 hours (an average of one hour per week), at an annual cost of just under £200,000. The POA argues that it is wrong to place staff on part-time contracts but then impose additional hours which staff have to work because they are in transit with prisoners. This has a knock-on effect on those working shorter contracts as it restricts their ability to boost their standard of living by taking other part-time jobs. POA proposes this should be rectified by introducing an enhanced overtime rate of time and a half and allowing those working a 20 hour or 35 hour week to choose to become full-time if they wish.

3.17 The POA also told us that PECCS staff are more likely to take sick leave than other NIPS staff which POA attributes to a large number of wrist injuries caused by being handcuffed to prisoners.

3.18 NIPS did not support either of these POA proposals. In their evidence they noted that Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland (CJINI) had recommended market testing the PECCS group and that any increase in their cost base would compromise an in-house bid in such a test. It acknowledged that staffing levels were below target levels stating that this was not a reflection that pay was insufficient to recruit and retain staff but an anticipation of the need to make savings once the detailed outcome of the Spending Review was known. If it was unable to employ staff on 20 hour contracts this would restrict operational flexibility which allowed them to respond effectively to peaks and troughs in the demand for the Service. On the question of injuries, NIPS said it was reviewing sickness management procedures, especially where staff have been injured on duty, and that although figures were high they were improving. We understand the Service is bringing in new types of handcuff to address the particular problem of wrist injuries which were a concern to the POA.

3.19 We are not convinced of the need to standardise the working week at 39 or 40 hours for all staff. Employing PECCS staff to work a range of differing weekly hours allows NIPS the flexibility to react appropriately to the fluctuating demands for this important service but also many PECCS staff will welcome the opportunity not to have to work a 39 or 40 hour week.

3.20 We heard concerns on visits about the lack of choice about and the unpredictability of overtime worked by PECCS, which was usually caused by the late running of the courts. Staff said this had a significant impact on their ability to plan their life away from work and that this overtime should be paid at an enhanced rate. We recognise the impact these kind of unpredictable demands place on staff, and have some sympathy with the view that the reward package should recognise this feature of the work.

3.21 However, there are a number of wider issues to consider before reaching conclusions on the right way forward. No other staff groups in the remit receive overtime pay at an enhanced rate for weekday working, although, in general, overtime for these staff is more predictable and volunteers are sought. We understand that there are also features of the way that PECCS staff are deployed which raise questions about whether more efficient use of overall resource is possible. It may be an inevitable feature of the job that much time is spent waiting around, but we also heard that if the courts finish earlier than expected, staff may be able to finish work before the end of their shift. We are not clear, however, about the frequency with which this happens.

3.22 Against that background we do not think we have had sufficiently strong evidence to date to justify special pay arrangements to compensate those in the PECCS group who are required to work overtime. We therefore make no recommendation, so overtime hours will continue to be paid at the current standard rate.

3.23 Nevertheless we ask the parties to provide us with more detailed evidence on the working patterns for this group of staff for our consideration next year. This should include: an analysis of the concentration of overtime in particular locations; an indication of whether most staff are affected or if this is an issue that disproportionately impacts on a minority for reasons of the way the service is organised; and whether staff are told at the recruitment stage that such unpredictable overtime is an element of the commitment expected.

3.24 We also invite the Service to consider with the POA whether there are ways of developing a new reward package (such as an annual hours contract) which would provide greater flexibility in terms of hours worked in any day, thereby supporting efficient service delivery, and incorporating an appropriate reward within the total package for the particular characteristics of the job, including unpredictable overtime. This could take account of any wider changes being discussed for uniformed staff in the Prison Service.

Driver allowance

3.25 The POA said that the drivers of the escort vehicles are responsible for the roadworthiness of their vehicle and are responsible for carrying out pre- and post-trip checks. In addition, they said, there is a new EU policy which will require an annual test for those driving public service vehicles. Together these justified an allowance for the drivers of escort vehicles.

3.26 NIPS did not support this proposal. Its policy in recent years had been to move away from the use of allowances and they did not see the duties of the escort vehicle drivers as meriting such an allowance.

3.27 Across an organisation the size of NIPS there will be a range of jobs requiring specific skills and knowledge and an expectation that individuals maintain and update these. We do not see any evidence to suggest there is a problem recruiting and retaining sufficiently qualified staff to drive escort vehicles that would justify the introduction of a specific allowance.

Cost of recommendations

3.28 Our recommendations add £160,000 to the total paybill in 2011-12.

Chapter 4: Looking ahead

Introduction 4.1 The pay freeze announced by the Westminster Government and the Northern Ireland Executive is for two years. However, we said in our response to the Minister's remit letter that we might wish to comment on issues to which we believe the Service should give attention in the interim. We do so in this chapter, commenting first on some specific concerns raised in evidence or on our visits and second on the wider prospects for reform in the Service.

**Comments
on matters
affecting staff
in the wider
remit group**

Nurse officers and healthcare assistants

4.2 In our 2010 Report we recommended a market supplement, in the form of a Qualified Nurse Premium Payment, as a short-term solution to recruitment problems. We invited the Service to put in place a longer-term solution but have not yet received proposals from them. The Service has also introduced a new role of healthcare assistant.

4.3 More generally, we heard on our visits mixed views on how well NHS clinical management was working and whether there would be advantage in transferring staff to the NHS, along the lines of the model used widely in England and Wales, to enable staff to develop and broaden their skills.

4.4 We continue to believe that the Service should look carefully at whether an alternative model for healthcare provision would better meet their long-term need to recruit and retain staff who have the appropriate range of skills and experience to provide healthcare in the Prison Service.

Governor pay

4.5 In our 2010 Report we recommended that NIPS review the relationship between governor pay and that of those who will move into governor grades, in the light of a 'roles and responsibilities' review then underway. The issues needing attention include the number and length of scales and the arrangements for setting pay on promotion.

4.6 We have not yet had proposals from this review, but in the interim the Service evidenced this year said they had had difficulty recruiting to fill the governing governor post in Maghaberry on a permanent basis. They were considering whether it should attract an improved remuneration package.

4.7 We take this opportunity to stress that we would expect any changes to governor pay to be on a sustainable basis, consistent with strategic reform of governor pay scales, and submitted to us for approval. We invite the Service to discuss with the PGA the reform of governor pay scales, with a view to the parties developing proposals, either jointly or separately, which would be ready for us to consider when the pay freeze comes to an end.

**The need for
long-term
reform**

4.8 As we made clear in our last Report, all the parties recognise change is needed to secure the reform of working practices which are essential to improving service delivery. The last three-year pay deal was an important stepping stone towards more fundamental change and delivered benefits in terms of better value for money and enhancements to the regime for prisoners.

4.9 We were encouraged to hear again this year a wish by all the parties to make progress on further long-term reforms. Much, however, remains to be done. The political focus brought by devolution and the recommendations of the Owers review provide an opportunity to drive this further change. As the Service evidence indicated, the Strategic

Effectiveness and Efficiency Programme is intended as a vehicle to deliver the changes needed, over a three-year period, to meet the twin challenges of improved efficiency and better outcomes for offenders.

4.10 We consider an innovative package on pay and conditions could play an important role in driving the culture change required. But we recognise this can only happen if a way can be found to fund a redundancy programme to accommodate those staff who will find it difficult to change their approach and to enable efficiencies to be secured through a more appropriate and flexible balance of officer and support grades. We urge the parties to work together on proposals for a wider package which could facilitate this.

4.11 Following our evidence sessions in Belfast, we were pleased to hear that the Service and the POA had agreed on a framework for further discussion of a wider reform package. We hope to hear during 2011 that they have reached an agreement which will enable substantive changes so the Service can meet the major challenges ahead.

Jerry Cope (Chair)

John Beath

Henrietta Campbell

Richard Childs

Bronwen Curtis

John Davies

Joe Magee

Appendix A: Standing terms of reference

The role of the Prison Service Pay Review Body is to provide independent advice on the remuneration of governing governors and operational managers, prison officers and support grades in the England and Wales Prison Service. The Review Body will also provide independent advice on the remuneration of prison governors, prison officers and support grades in the Northern Ireland Prison Service.

In reaching its recommendations the Review Body is to take into account the following:

- The need to recruit, retain and motivate suitably able and qualified staff taking into account the specific needs of the Prison Service in England and Wales and the Northern Ireland Prison Service;
- Regional/local variations in labour markets and their effects on the recruitment and retention of staff;
- Relevant legal obligations on the Prison Service in England and Wales and the Northern Ireland Prison Service, including anti-discrimination legislation regarding age, gender, race, sexual orientation, religion and belief and disability;
- Government policies for improving the public services, including the requirement to meet Prison Service output targets for the delivery of services;
- The funds available to the Prison Service in England and Wales and the Northern Ireland Prison Service as set out in the Government's departmental expenditure limits; and
- The Government's inflation target.

The Review Body shall also take account of the competitiveness of the Prison Service in England and Wales with the private sector, and any differences in terms and conditions of employment between the public and private sectors taking account of the broad employment package including relative job security.

The Review Body may also be asked to consider other specific issues.

The Review Body is also required to take careful account of the economic and other evidence submitted by the Government, staff and professional representatives and others.

Reports and recommendations for the Prison Service in England and Wales should be submitted to the Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice. Reports and recommendations for the Northern Ireland Prison Service will be submitted to the Minister of Justice, Northern Ireland.

Appendix B: Remit letter from the Minister of Justice, Northern Ireland

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE



Department of

Justice

www.dojni.gov.uk

Minister's Office
Block B, Castle Buildings
Ballymiscaw
Belfast
BT4 3SG
Tel: 028 90528121
Fax: 028 90528434
Teletext: 028 90527668
private.office@dojni.x.gsi.gov.uk

Your ref:
Our ref: SUB/812/2010

Mr Jerry Cope
Chair
Prison Service Pay Review Body
Office of Manpower Economics
6th Floor
Kingsgate House
66-74 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6SW

22 September 2010

Dear Mr Cope

PRISON SERVICE PAY REVIEW BODY REMIT 2011/12

I am writing to outline the context in which I am seeking the advice of the Prison Service Pay Review Body (PSPRB) in respect of the Northern Ireland Prison Service.

As you know, in light of the exceptional economic circumstances, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced a two year pay freeze for all public sector workers (except for full time equivalents earning £21,000 or less per year) as part of his 22 June Emergency Budget. The freeze will apply to all Northern Ireland staff groups subject to the Northern Ireland Executive's pay policy; which includes remit group staff in the Northern Ireland Prison Service.

I recognise that the PSPRB bring an independent and expert view and that your contribution in making robust, evidence-based pay recommendations is valued and much appreciated by those representing the Northern Ireland Prison Service. It is my intention following the pay freeze that the Review Body should continue its role to provide recommendations to me on the pay related matters following an assessment of the evidence presented.

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE



2011/12 Remit

Agreement has already been reached that detailed evidence will be presented to the Review Body by 18 October. I will be submitting evidence in respect of those employees within the remit group earning a full-time equivalent of £21,000 or less. For those groups earning above £21,000, I will not submit evidence or seek recommendations on pay uplift.

Wider Issues

You will recall that the Northern Ireland Prison Service has been working on proposals for Workforce Reform, which may be linked to a multi-year approach to pay. Work is continuing on how best to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Prison Service, and Workforce Reform has now been incorporated into the Strategic Efficiency and Effectiveness Programme. This will involve a fundamental review of the operating model of each of the prisons and will impact on the number and manner of staff deployment. Given the pay freeze and the wider economic climate it is unlikely that this will impact on salaries, but there may be an impact on wider terms and conditions. My officials will keep the Review Body updated as progress is made.

I would be grateful if the Review Body could report its recommendations in respect of remit group employees earning the full equivalent of £21,000 or less to me by the end of February 2011.

I look forward to meeting you again in November and receiving your recommendations in due course.

Yours

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Ford".

DAVID FORD MLA
Minister of Justice

Appendix C: PSPRB reply to the Minister of Justice, Northern Ireland



OFFICE OF MANPOWER ECONOMICS

KINGSGATE HOUSE
66-74 VICTORIA STREET
LONDON SW1E 6SW

Direct Telephone Line 020 7215 8417

GTN 215

Fax 020 7215 4445

Website ome.uk.com

Email jenny.eastbrook@bis.gsi.gov.uk

David Ford MLA
Minister of Justice
Block B, Castle Buildings
Ballymiscaw
Belfast
BT4 3SG

5 October 2010

Dear Minister

ACTIVATION OF THE PRISON SERVICE PAY REVIEW BODY PROCESS

Thank you for your letter of 22 September asking the Prison Service Pay Review Body to make recommendations in relation to 2010-11 pay. I am pleased to confirm we will initiate the process with the parties, with a view to delivering our report by the end of February 2011.

I note that in view of the exceptional economic circumstances, and the announcement of a pay freeze for public sector workers earning over £21,000, you are asking us to make recommendations only in relation to those remit group employees. We will therefore invite the parties to focus their evidence on these groups (including night custody officers who earn just over £21,000 for a 44 hour week). However, we will also welcome the submission of background information on recruitment, retention and motivation of the remit group as a whole. This will help us understand the context in which we make our recommendations for 2011, and leave us better placed to make recommendations for the full remit group in future rounds. We may also wish to comment, but without making formal recommendations, on issues to which we believe the Service should give attention in the interim.

I welcome your reiteration of the value you attach to the Review Body's independence and your intention to ask us to continue our normal role following the pay freeze.

I am copying this letter to the PGA(NI) and POA(NI).

Yours sincerely

Jerry Cope

JC JERRY COPE
Chairman
Prison Service Pay Review Body



Appendix D: Current and recommended pay levels for 1 April 2011

Governor grades

Grade		Current range £ per annum (spine point)	Recommended range from 1 April 2011 £ per annum (spine point)
Governor 1	Maximum	80,550 (338)	80,550 (338)
	Minimum	74,747 (323)	74,747 (323)
Governor 2	Maximum	72,183 (316)	72,183 (316)
	Minimum	67,983 (304)	67,983 (304)
Governor 3	Maximum	62,766 (288)	62,766 (288)
	Minimum	58,824 (275)	58,824 (275)
Governor 4	Maximum	55,407 (263)	55,407 (263)
	Minimum	51,156 (247)	51,156 (247)
Governor 5	Maximum	50,396 (244)	50,396 (244)
	Minimum	44,934 (221)	44,934 (221)
	Trainee rate	37,551 (185)	37,551 (185)

Officers, support grades and other grades

Grade		Current range £ per annum (spine point)	Recommended range from 1 April 2011 £ per annum (spine point)
Officers (Pre-2002)			
Principal officer		45,110	45,110
Senior officer		40,831	40,831
Main grade officer	Maximum	37,364 (184)	37,364 (184)
	Minimum	19,538 (54)	19,538 (54)
Officers (Post-2002)			
Principal officer		34,964	34,964
Senior officer		32,121	32,121
Main grade officer	Year 6	30,105	30,105
	Year 5	29,212	29,212
	Year 4	28,239	28,239
	Year 3	26,291	26,291
	Year 2	25,318	25,318
	Year 1	24,344	24,344
	Entry	22,397	22,397
Auxiliary	Maximum	21,588 (74)	21,588 (74)
Night patrol officer	Maximum	18,454	18,704
Night custody officer		21,359	21,609
Operational support grade		19,596	19,846
Healthcare assistant	Point 3	19,596	19,846
	Point 2	18,293	18,543
	Point 1	17,039	17,289
		Current rate £ per hour	Recommended rate £ per hour
Senior prisoner custody officer		9.51	9.63
Prisoner custody officer		8.65	8.77

Notes

1. For the spinal table, the value of each spinal point is 0.5 per cent higher than the previous point.
2. Nurse officers, senior and principal nurse officers on the post-2002 scales will receive a Qualified Nurse Premium Payment of £2,500 per annum.
3. The governor 5 scale will use only the following spinal points: 221, 224, 226, 228, 230, 232, 234, 236, 238, 240, 242 and 244.

Spinal Scales (1-338) – Auxiliary, Officer and Governor Grades

Point	£ per annum	Point	£ per annum	Point	£ per annum	Point	£ per annum
338	80,550	289	63,080	240	49,401	191	38,694
337	80,149	288	62,766	239	49,155	190	38,501
336	79,750	287	62,454	238	48,910	189	38,309
335	79,354	286	62,143	237	48,667	188	38,118
334	78,960	285	61,834	236	48,425	187	37,928
333	78,567	284	61,526	235	48,184	186	37,739
332	78,177	283	61,220	234	47,944	185	37,551
331	77,788	282	60,915	233	47,705	184	37,364
330	77,401	281	60,612	232	47,468	183	37,178
329	77,016	280	60,310	231	47,232	182	36,993
328	76,633	279	60,010	230	46,997	181	36,809
327	76,252	278	59,711	229	46,763	180	36,626
326	75,873	277	59,414	228	46,530	179	36,444
325	75,496	276	59,118	227	46,299	178	36,263
324	75,120	275	58,824	226	46,069	177	36,083
323	74,747	274	58,531	225	45,840	176	35,903
322	74,376	273	58,240	224	45,612	175	35,724
321	74,006	272	57,950	223	45,385	174	35,546
320	73,638	271	57,662	222	45,159	173	35,369
319	73,272	270	57,375	221	44,934	172	35,193
318	72,907	269	57,090	220	44,710	171	35,018
317	72,544	268	56,806	219	44,488	170	34,844
316	72,183	267	56,523	218	44,267	169	34,671
315	71,823	266	56,242	217	44,047	168	34,499
314	71,465	265	55,962	216	43,828	167	34,327
313	71,109	264	55,684	215	43,610	166	34,156
312	70,755	263	55,407	214	43,393	165	33,986
311	70,402	262	55,131	213	43,177	164	33,817
310	70,051	261	54,857	212	42,962	163	33,649
309	69,702	260	54,584	211	42,748	162	33,482
308	69,355	259	54,312	210	42,535	161	33,315
307	69,009	258	54,042	209	42,323	160	33,149
306	68,665	257	53,773	208	42,112	159	32,984
305	68,323	256	53,505	207	41,902	158	32,820
304	67,983	255	53,239	206	41,694	157	32,657
303	67,644	254	52,974	205	41,487	156	32,495
302	67,307	253	52,710	204	41,281	155	32,333
301	66,972	252	52,448	203	41,076	154	32,172
300	66,638	251	52,187	202	40,872	153	32,012
299	66,306	250	51,927	201	40,669	152	31,853
298	65,976	249	51,669	200	40,467	151	31,695
297	65,648	248	51,412	199	40,266	150	31,537
296	65,321	247	51,156	198	40,066	149	31,380
295	64,996	246	50,901	197	39,867	148	31,224
294	64,673	245	50,648	196	39,669	147	31,069
293	64,351	244	50,396	195	39,472	146	30,914
292	64,031	243	50,145	194	39,276	145	30,760
291	63,712	242	49,896	193	39,081	144	30,607
290	63,395	241	49,648	192	38,887	143	30,455

Spinal Scales (1-338) – Auxiliary, Officer and Governor Grades (continued)

Point	£ per annum	Point	£ per annum	Point	£ per annum	Point	£ per annum
142	30,303	105	25,196	68	20,952	31	17,421
141	30,152	104	25,071	67	20,848	30	17,334
140	30,002	103	24,946	66	20,744	29	17,248
139	29,853	102	24,822	65	20,641	28	17,162
138	29,704	101	24,699	64	20,538	27	17,077
137	29,556	100	24,576	63	20,436	26	16,992
136	29,409	99	24,454	62	20,334	25	16,907
135	29,263	98	24,332	61	20,233	24	16,823
134	29,117	97	24,211	60	20,132	23	16,739
133	28,972	96	24,091	59	20,032	22	16,656
132	28,828	95	23,971	58	19,932	21	16,573
131	28,685	94	23,852	57	19,833	20	16,491
130	28,542	93	23,733	56	19,734	19	16,409
129	28,400	92	23,615	55	19,636	18	16,327
128	28,259	91	23,498	54	19,538	17	16,246
127	28,118	90	23,381	53	19,441	16	16,165
126	27,978	89	23,265	52	19,344	15	16,085
125	27,839	88	23,149	51	19,248	14	16,005
124	27,700	87	23,034	50	19,152	13	15,925
123	27,562	86	22,919	49	19,057	12	15,846
122	27,425	85	22,805	48	18,962	11	15,767
121	27,289	84	22,692	47	18,868	10	15,689
120	27,153	83	22,579	46	18,774	9	15,611
119	27,018	82	22,467	45	18,681	8	15,533
118	26,884	81	22,355	44	18,588	7	15,456
117	26,750	80	22,244	43	18,496	6	15,379
116	26,617	79	22,133	42	18,404	5	15,302
115	26,485	78	22,023	41	18,312	4	15,226
114	26,353	77	21,913	40	18,221	3	15,150
113	26,222	76	21,804	39	18,130	2	15,075
112	26,092	75	21,696	38	18,040	1	15,000
111	25,962	74	21,588	37	17,950		
110	25,833	73	21,481	36	17,861		
109	25,704	72	21,374	35	17,772		
108	25,576	71	21,268	34	17,684		
107	25,449	70	21,162	33	17,596		
106	25,322	69	21,057	32	17,508		

Appendix E: Current and recommended allowances

We have not made a recommendation to change specialist and other allowances which remain at their current level

	<i>Level from 1 April 2011 £ per annum</i>
<i>Specialist allowances¹</i>	
Librarian	679
Dog handler	723
Physical education instructor	723
Groundsman	723
Hospital officer	814
Emergency control room staff	852
Works officer	949
Laundry officer	1,062
Caterer	1,118
Weapons officer	1,118
Fire officer	1,132
Instructor ²	1,183
	1,490
Firearms officer	2,322
<i>Other allowances³</i>	
Dog grooming allowance	4,526
Boot allowance	92.80
Clothing allowance	603.65

¹ Specialist allowances are not paid to new staff entering these specialisms. Those in receipt of allowances continue to receive them on a protected basis while they remain in their specialism.

² The two different rates of payment relate to the different skills levels.

³ Paid to all officer grade staff who meet the eligibility criteria for payment.