



THOMSON REUTERS

IDS

# Pay, pensions and reward packages for private custodial service staff

A research report for the Office of Manpower Economics

from

Incomes Data Services

March 2015

This report was researched and written by Incomes Data Services (IDS) for the Office of Manpower Economics on behalf of the Prison Service Pay Review Body.

The authors of this report are:

Louisa Withers  
Sue Milsome  
Raymond Storry

Incomes Data Services  
Finsbury Tower  
Bunhill Row  
London  
EC1Y 8LZ

Telephone: 0845 077 2911  
Facsimilie: 0845 310 5517  
E-mail: [ids@incomesdata.co.uk](mailto:ids@incomesdata.co.uk)  
Website: [www.incomesdata.co.uk](http://www.incomesdata.co.uk)

## Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
1 INTRODUCTION .....	7
1.1 PRIVATE SECTOR CUSTODIAL SERVICES.....	7
1.2 METHODOLOGY .....	8
1.3 SAMPLE.....	11
2 PAY SETTING IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.....	12
2.1 APPROACHES ADOPTED .....	12
2.1.1 Pay setting.....	12
2.1.2 Pay systems.....	13
2.1.3 Progression.....	13
2.1.4 Pay bargaining .....	13
2.1.5 Recent pay increases .....	14
2.2 HOURS AND HOLIDAYS .....	14
2.2.1 Working time.....	14
2.2.2 Working patterns .....	14
2.2.3 Holidays.....	14
2.3 UNSOCIAL HOURS, ADDITIONAL HOURS AND OTHER ALLOWANCES.....	15
2.3.1 Shift pay, unsocial hours payments, standby and on-call .....	15
2.3.2 Overtime .....	15
2.3.3 Allowances .....	15
2.4 BONUS AND INCENTIVE PAY .....	15
2.4.1 Bonuses .....	15
2.4.2 Share schemes and other incentives.....	16
2.5 BENEFITS.....	16
2.5.1 Pensions .....	16
2.5.2 Sick pay entitlement .....	17
2.5.3 Company cars.....	17
2.5.4 Private medical insurance .....	17
2.6 STAFFING ISSUES .....	18
2.6.1 Sickness absence .....	18
2.6.2 Recruitment and retention difficulties .....	18
2.6.3 Labour turnover .....	18
2.6.4 Time taken to fill roles.....	19
2.6.5 Future developments .....	19
3 BENCHMARKING.....	20
3.1 TECHNICAL NOTES .....	20
3.2 MARKET SUMMARY .....	21
3.2.1 Basic pay.....	21
3.2.2 Total reward .....	21
3.3 COMPARISONS .....	22
3.3.1 Basic pay comparisons .....	22
3.3.2 Total reward .....	23

## Tables

Table 1 Privately-managed prisons and IRCs in England and Wales, 2014.....	7
Table 2 Private sector custodial services market summary – basic pay.....	21
Table 3 Private sector custodial services market summary – total reward.....	21
Table 4 Benchmark comparison - basic pay, Fair and Sustainable.....	22
Table 5 Benchmark comparison - basic pay, closed scales.....	22
Table 6 Benchmark comparison - total reward, Fair and Sustainable.....	23
Table 7 Benchmark comparison - total reward, closed scales.....	23
Chart 1 Fair and Sustainable basic pay and Total Reward versus the private sector....	24

## Executive summary

This report presents analysis comparing reward packages in public and private custodial services. This provides updated results as work in this area was last undertaken by MCG Consulting in 2006. Our approach differs slightly from that undertaken previously in that it provides a comparison for each grade, rather than groupings by broad level. It also compares the two pay and reward systems currently in operation in the public sector, following implementation of 'Fair and Sustainable' in 2013.

The key findings of this report are as follows:

### Pay setting

- Private-sector companies operate similar pay setting mechanisms to those in the public sector more broadly (outside the Review Body coverage) with union negotiations over the award for the year;
- Private sector pay is managed centrally, with little local flexibility and pay levels are set initially with reference to the public sector, local labour market and pay for other security-type jobs.

### Pay levels

- Remuneration levels in the public sector are either ahead or in line with the private sector up to and including Band 7 (Manager F on the closed scales), at which point public sector custodial pay significantly falls behind the private sector;

### Reward packages

- Reward packages for officers in the private sector are less generous than for those in the public sector and are typically limited to basic pay and a defined contribution pension scheme;
- Packages for senior staff are generally more generous in the private sector than in the public sector, including additional benefits such as private medical insurance, a company car and bonuses;
- Employer pension contributions are significantly lower in the private sector, ranging from 1 to 12 per cent, compared to employer contributions of between 16.7 and 24.3 per cent under the Civil Service Pension Scheme.

### Recruitment and retention

- Private sector employers did not seem to be experiencing much in the way of recruitment and retention difficulties;
- Officers are recruited from all walks of life, although private companies do face competition from public sector prisons and police;

- Managers and governors were previously attracted from the public sector but now managers are increasingly home-grown.

#### **Staff turnover**

- Overall staff turnover levels are higher than those typically found in the public sector.

#### **Sickness absence**

- Public sector sickness levels are at the upper end of sickness absence levels reported in the private sector, which ranged from 2.2 to 5 per cent;
- All the private sector employers operate sickness management policies.

## 1 Introduction

Incomes Data Services (IDS) was commissioned by the Office of Manpower Economics (OME) to undertake research on the pay, pensions and reward packages for private custodial services staff in England and Wales on behalf of the Prison Service Pay Review Body (PSPRB).

The PSPRB provides independent advice and recommendations on the remuneration of governing governors and operational managers, prison officers and support grades in the England and Wales and Northern Ireland Prison Services. As part of this remit, the PSPRB requires factual information on the reward packages for custodial services staff employed in privately-managed prisons and immigration removal centres in England and Wales.

### 1.1 Private sector custodial services

Initial discussions with the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and the Home Office established that the 14 privately-managed prisons and seven Immigration Removal Centres (IRCs) in England and Wales are operated by five employers (see Table 1).

Table 1 Privately-managed prisons and IRCs in England and Wales, 2014

Contractor	Site
G4S Justice Services	Brook House IRC
	HMP & YOI Altcourse
	HMP & YOI Parc
	HMP Birmingham
	HMP Oakwood
	HMP Rye Hill
	Tinsley House IRC
MITIE Care and Custody	Campsfield House IRC
	Colnbrook IRC
	Harmondsworth IRC
Serco Custodial Services	HMP Dovegate
	HMP Ashfield
	HMP Doncaster
	HMP Lowdham Grange
	HMP Thameside
	Yarl's Wood IRC
Sodexo Justice Services	HMP & YOI Bronzefield
	HMP Forest Bank
	HMP Northumberland
	HMP Peterborough
Tascor (Capita)	Pennine House IRC*

\*Pennine House at Manchester Airport is a residential short-term immigration removal holding facility.

Custodial services form a small part of the activities of the larger organisations, representing between 1 and 9 per cent of employees. This is particularly pertinent in the case of Tascor. Tascor operates a large escorting service which covers more than 70,000 'secure movements' of individuals within the UK and the escorting and removal of more than 18,000 individuals from the UK each year. As part of its immigration removal detainee programme, Tascor operates Pennine House at Manchester Airport, a residential short-term immigration removal holding facility with space for 32 detainees in eight rooms, which is much smaller than the other IRCs and can only hold detainees for periods of seven days or less.

Through our discussions with NOMS and the Home Office we also established that prisons and IRCs are quite different in terms of both their scale and working environment. Privately-managed prisons hold around 1,000 to 1,500 inmates versus a few hundred in IRCs (Harmondsworth at Heathrow is the largest at 800 detainees). Furthermore, there are a range of environmental differences, such as the cultural needs of populations and differences in levels of compliance between prison and IRC populations.

## **1.2 Methodology**

### **a. Data collection**

The information and analysis contained in this report is based on data collected by IDS from four<sup>1</sup> private-sector firms operating contracts to manage prisons and IRCs.

Given the sensitive nature of the work, our approach focused in the first instance on establishing a good relationship with the private companies and we adopted a staged approach to allow for further development and refinement of the data collection methodology.

As a starting point, IDS met with NOMS to be briefed on the overall differences between public and private sector prisons and how reward for custodial staff differs in the two sectors. NOMS was also asked for its views on the feasibility of gathering detailed and confidential information on reward from private sector employers, and for the names of representatives of those employers who could be approached for assistance.

The Home Office was then asked to help IDS understand the differences in reward outcomes for custodial staff in private and public sector IRCs, and for its help in identifying contacts at the three private sector employers with contracts to operate the IRCs.

---

<sup>1</sup>Tascor is excluded from this exercise.



IDS then drew up a detailed questionnaire to use when interviewing the four employers. Brief job descriptions of all public sector custodial roles in prisons and IRCs were written, so that private and public sector roles could be compared.

The employers were approached by e-mail in the first instance, with full details of the project, an indication of the broad areas about which IDS would be asking questions, and guarantees of confidentiality. Organisations were told that no information would be attributed to individual organisations and that all terms and conditions of employment would be identified in ranges and averages only.

Face-to-face interviews lasting around two hours took place with the four employers between mid October 2014 and early November 2014 with either the managing director, the HR director, or both. Queries were followed up by e-mail after the interviews. Interviewees were asked in advance of the meetings and again at the beginning of the interviews whether the discussions could be taped for the benefit of the researchers. Permission was given provided IDS undertook to destroy the tapes once the notes had been taken, and this has been done.

#### **b. Job matching**

Jobs were matched through discussions with the employers about their jobs and the distribution of work during the interviews. IDS prepared some short capsules summarising the public sector jobs to facilitate these discussions.

In all cases job titles varied slightly from those used in the public sector. Despite this the jobs are broadly comparable<sup>2</sup>, although the private sector equivalents of governing governors and deputy governors were expected to be aware of the commercial aspects of operating the contract and to focus on service delivery. For example, one organisation expects its governors to take on the full commercial responsibility for running a prison, while another found this was too much for its governor equivalents and now supports them with additional quality performance and account management roles, which report to the board level account director.

Two of the companies were able to identify suitable matches for all seven job roles, the third identified matches for six of the roles and the fourth employer operates fewer grades and could only match to four of the jobs.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that IDS has not undertaken any evaluations of individual jobs at the private sector employers.

### c. Public sector data

Data on reward packages in the public sector was provided by NOMS.

Salaries for public sector staff employed on the closed scales are the maximum of the bands, since most staff are either at the maximum or will move to this point following the April 2015 pay round. Consequently the maximum provides a more accurate reflection of earnings for these staff. Unsocial hours payments are included (consolidated) as part of the basic salary on the closed scales. There is an additional payment in recognition of unsocial and unpredictable hours for Manager E and F of £5,529 (Required Hours Addition (RHA)). RHA for Senior Manager D<sup>3</sup>, C, B and A has been consolidated into basic salary.

Typical salaries for public sector staff employed on Fair and Sustainable contracts are based on the most populated pay points for staff in Bands 2 to 5 and the median salary for Bands 7 to 11. For Bands 2 to 5 the salary figure includes unsocial hours and two additional hours and for Bands 7 to 11 it also includes RHA.

Employer pension contributions data is drawn from the Civil Service Pensions website for 2014/15<sup>4</sup> and vary by salary as follows:

- £22,000 and under, 16.7%;
- £22,001-£44,500, 18.8%;
- £44,501-£74,500, 21.8%;
- £74,501 and over, 24.3%.

Holiday data is based on basic NOMS entitlement of 25 days, plus eight bank holidays and one privilege day for the Queen's birthday (34 days)<sup>5</sup>.

There is a non-consolidated performance award worth 2 per cent for senior managers at maxima on the closed scales in lieu of not being able to progress further. It has been included in the analysis for Managers A to F on the closed scales since the vast majority are at the maxima and has been *excluded* for senior managers in Bands 7 to 11.

Managers in Band 6 and above are eligible for performance awards worth 1 per cent. However, these performance awards have been *excluded* from this analysis since these are

---

<sup>3</sup> There are two scales for Manager D, one with RHA and one without however when RHA is added to the salary for the grade without RHA the maximums are the same.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.civilservicepensionscheme.org.uk/employers/employer-contribution-rates/>

<sup>5</sup> Maximum holiday entitlements range from 39 to 40.5 days depending on length of service and start date.

only payable to eligible staff achieving the highest performance marking; typically around 25 per cent under a guided distribution.

The following payments have been *excluded* from this analysis as they are occasional and/or only apply to small proportions of the population:

- dirty protest payment;
- Payment Plus;
- on-call and standby allowances;
- dog-related allowance;
- specialist allowances; and
- Operation Tornado.

All data is based on the national pay ranges, excluding any location payments.

### **1.3 Sample**

This report is based on data collected by IDS from four private-sector firms operating contracts to manage prisons and IRCs in England and Wales. The four organisations between them employ 7,189 staff in prisons and IRCs, ranging from 585 in the smallest organisation to 2,850 in the largest. Part-time staff comprise around 8 per cent of the total. Women make up between 33 per cent and 40 per cent of the individual workforces.

## **2 Pay setting in the private sector**

In this section of the report we outline approaches to pay, pensions and reward packages for private custodial service staff. All findings are presented in the form of ranges so that organisations' individual arrangements cannot be identified.

### **2.1 Approaches adopted**

#### **2.1.1 Pay setting**

Custodial services form a small part – between one per cent and nine per cent in terms of the number of employees – of the activities of the large organisations which provide a range of services to the public sector. The approaches of the parent organisations to pay and reward have varying degrees of influence on pay in prisons and IRCs, with more influence on non-pay terms and conditions and reward for senior managers than on pay for front line staff.

Pay for custodial staff in the private sector is set and controlled centrally, with almost no discretion at local level. It is determined initially on a contract-by-contract basis, which means that it differs by establishment. It varies between establishments according to market factors, location, whether it is a prison or an IRC and, in some but not all cases, the size and complexity of the prison or IRC. Pay for senior managers tends to vary by the number of people reporting to the role, budgetary responsibilities, and impact on strategy – that is, the factors determining managerial pay in any sector.

When setting pay, one of the four employers uses Hay job evaluation, one has a home-grown scheme, one uses 'informal' job evaluation and one does not use any form of job evaluation. Teams working on contract bids look at public sector prison terms and conditions, pay for similar security-type roles in the area, vocational jobs such as social services and the police force and the pay rates of custodial sector competitors. One organisation uses market data from Hay and Towers Watson for all roles. Two organisations aim to locate all their salaries within the parent companies' pay ranges, although one of these commented that market conditions were always more important than the bands.

Once initial pay levels have been set, apart from annual increases, they are generally not looked at again unless there is a problem with recruitment or retention. One organisation is trying to rationalise pay at the moment, commenting that only some differentials between establishments can be justified by geographical and labour market factors. In the future it hopes that all front line pay will be determined by pay ranges operating across all its establishments.

There is little local discretion to vary pay or other terms and conditions, and one company makes spot checks to ensure that there are no ad hoc payments or pay uplifts. Governors can make a case for pay variation, but it must be approved by head office. The organisation that gives governors most flexibility says that they have the discretion to vary pay by up to 5 per cent, but must seek HR advice before they do so.

### **2.1.2 Pay systems**

Pay systems vary from organisation to organisation, and include short incremental scales, salary ranges, and spot salaries. Two companies adopt the same approach to all their staff and the other two operate salary ranges for management roles and spot salaries for front-line staff.

### **2.1.3 Progression**

Progression arrangements vary by employer and by site in some cases too and both service and performance are factors determining progression, usually in the form of a hybrid model.

### **2.1.4 Pay bargaining**

All four organisations recognise trade unions for collective bargaining. Each recognises different unions, including the POA, PGA, Community, GMB, PCS and Prospect. For three companies, each establishment is a separate bargaining unit, while the fourth negotiates an annual increase with the trade unions at national level. Collective bargaining covers all front-line staff, and managers in some organisations.

Annual pay awards are based on affordability, company performance and the cost of living, and tend to be strongly influenced by the contract uplift at each site, which can be based on the Retail Prices Index or other indices.

One company negotiates an annual increase with the trade unions at national level, based on affordability and the cost of living, and all staff, whatever their role and level of performance, receive that increase. In a second company the parent organisation specifies a range of increases, for example one to three per cent, and the custodial division decides on a figure within that range, based on its own performance. Pay for front line staff is negotiated with the trade unions separately for each establishment, while managers receive pay increases based more on their individual performance.

A third company is given a company-wide figure for all staff outside collective bargaining, that is, supervisors and above, and although anomalies can be dealt with, in the main, staff receive that level of increase. At this organisation, the trade unions negotiate a settlement

for front line staff based on the financial outcomes and levels of service delivery at the establishment.

The fourth employer sets a pay pot, which is strongly influenced by the level of public sector settlements. The governor-equivalent role has the flexibility to use the pay pot to address local issues.

### **2.1.5 Recent pay increases**

The level of recent pay increases range from 1 per cent to 3 per cent. At one establishment there was a 5 per cent pay increase in 2013, following three years when pay did not rise at all.

## **2.2 Hours and holidays**

### **2.2.1 Working time**

Most staff are employed on either full or part-time permanent contracts. Temporary staff might be used to provide cover for maternity leave or long term sickness. A few individuals are employed on zero hours contracts to provide specific, unpredictable services, such as escorting prisoners or detainees, or guarding them while in hospital.

Contractual working weeks in the four organisations are either 39 hours or 40 hours in prisons and range from 40 to 48.5 hours in IRCs. Contractual hours vary by establishment.

### **2.2.2 Working patterns**

Staff in prisons and IRCs work a wide variety of shifts, with arrangements varying by establishment. Most employees work continuous rotating shifts over 24 hours, seven days a week, over 16, 20 or 24 weeks. Some employees work permanent nights, though one organisation discourages this. A common permanent night shift pattern is seven nights on, seven nights off.

### **2.2.3 Holidays**

The basic holiday entitlement of prison officers, detention custody officers and operational support grades is 20 days in two organisations and 22 days in the other two. Basic holiday entitlement for governors and centre managers ranges from 23 days to 25 days. Holiday entitlement for supervisors up to deputy governors ranges from 20 days to 25 days.

Holiday entitlement most often increases at the rate of one additional day per year of service, generally up to a total of 25 days or 27 days for front line staff. Entitlement rises to 28 days for governors in one company and 25 days elsewhere.

All the firms honour the eight public bank holidays. There are no additional customary holidays.

Holiday pay is basic pay only.

## **2.3 Unsocial hours, additional hours and other allowances**

### **2.3.1 Shift pay, unsocial hours payments, standby and on-call**

With the exception of one organisation which pays an additional £1,000 a year for those who work permanent nights, there are no additions to pay in private sector prisons and IRCs for shift working, working nights or working at the weekend or on bank holidays.

There are also no additional payments for working unsocial hours or being on-call.

### **2.3.2 Overtime**

The average amount of paid overtime worked by front line staff ranges from almost none to eight hours a week. One company said that the number of overtime hours worked averaged about four per month, but these tended to be unpaid since staff take time off in lieu. Custodial managers and above are expected to work the hours required to get the job done without additional payment.

Overtime premia, which are only paid once normal full-time weekly hours have been worked, range from single time-to-time-and-a-half. One company pays double time on bank holidays but the other three pay the same premia regardless of when hours are worked.

### **2.3.3 Allowances**

One organisation pays a London allowance for a prison in the Home Counties, while others pay more to staff working in the South East but have no specific allowances.

The only other allowance paid by the private sector employers is to Tornado trained officers. Two organisations pay the public sector hourly premium. One says that its officers have never been called out but that if they were the company would expect to pay them time-to-time-and-a-half.

## **2.4 Bonus and incentive pay**

### **2.4.1 Bonuses**

All four private sector employers pay bonuses, based on a combination of financial outcomes and individual performance. All four employers pay these to governors, deputy governors

and heads of function and one also pays a bonus to its custodial managers. Bonuses for governors and centre managers across all four organisations range from zero to 30 per cent while for deputy governors/deputy centre managers the range is zero to 20 per cent. Senior managers can earn zero to 15 per cent while custodial managers may receive up to 5 per cent. In general, most managers receive about 60 per cent of the maximum possible bonus; it is rare for a manager not to receive a bonus at all.

#### **2.4.2 Share schemes and other incentives**

One employer runs Save As Your Earn share option schemes, whereby any employee can save to buy shares at fixed prices. This company gives its centre managers the opportunity to buy equity in the organisation with their own money.

### **2.5 Benefits**

#### **2.5.1 Pensions**

None of the four employers operates a defined benefit pension schemes. All are now operating auto enrolment into defined contribution schemes, with a minimum of 1 per cent employee contribution and 1 per cent employer contribution.

For prison custody officers, detention custody officers and operational support officers in two organisations (and in one case for supervisors too) employers only contribute 1 per cent to match the minimum 1 per cent employee contribution. In a third organisation the employer matches employee contributions of 2 per cent at some sites and 4 per cent at others.

Governors and IRC centre managers receive employer pension contributions up to maximums ranging from 6 per cent to 12 per cent, with employees contributing between zero and 6 per cent. In some cases the employee contribution is matched, in others the employer pays twice as much as the employee.

Grades between front line staff and governor/centre manager grades receive employer contributions between 1 per cent and 8 per cent. As with governor/centre manager grades, in some cases the employee contribution is matched, in others the employer pays twice as much as the employee.

The four companies told us that only a minority of employers contribute more than the compulsory 1 per cent required by auto enrolment.

In all cases only basic pay is pensionable.



### **2.5.2 Sick pay entitlement**

In most organisations, sick pay entitlement for front line staff is different to that for managerial grades. Entitlement for prison custody officers, detention custody officers and operational support officers employed by the four companies ranges from zero to Statutory Sick Pay for the first six months and from Statutory Sick Pay to 20 days in any 12-month period for the next six months. Maximum entitlements for front line staff ranges from 25 days in any 12-month period to 12 weeks after five years' service.

For managers, sick pay entitlement ranges from zero to 25 days during the first six months of service, rising to maximums for governors/centre managers ranging from 24 days in any continuous 12-month period after eight years to six months' full pay and six months' half pay after three months' service for prison governors in one firm.

All four organisations operate sickness management policies. One pays no sick pay once an individual has been absent for three occasions in 12 months or for 6 per cent of their working time over the same period (this organisation also has the lowest level of sickness absence). Another company paid an attendance bonus of £250 in 2013 and absence levels reduced. The bonus was withdrawn in 2014 and absence rose. A third company has some legacy attendance bonuses of £100 to £200 a year, but these are being phased out.

### **2.5.3 Company cars**

Prison governors and IRC centre managers receive a status car in all four organisations. Two organisations also provide deputy governors/centre managers with a car and in one of these cases heads of function have a car too. With the exception of deputy governors/deputy centre managers and heads of function working for one firm, those receiving status cars can opt for a cash allowance instead, with allowances ranging from £5,700 to £10,000 a year.

### **2.5.4 Private medical insurance**

Heads of function receive individual private medical insurance in two organisations. All governors and centre managers and their deputies receive private medical insurance: for themselves and their families in one company; for themselves and their partner in one; and for themselves only in the other two. Estimates by the companies of the value of the individual benefit range from £500 to £700 a year.

One organisation provides all staff with income protection insurance after two years' service.

## **2.6 Staffing issues**

### **2.6.1 Sickness absence**

Sickness absence levels ranged from 2.2 per cent to 5 per cent among private sector prisons and IRCs.

### **2.6.2 Recruitment and retention difficulties**

In the main, firms did not seem to be experiencing much in the way of recruitment and retention difficulties. One organisation reported receiving 200 applications within two hours of advertising for a batch of 15 recruits. Pay is rarely an issue, except when there is warehouse or logistics work in the vicinity of the site which provides competition for this labour market.

Recruits come from all walks of life and may previously have been carers, office workers, managers or security staff. 'We will recruit anyone with appropriate life experience' said one firm while another said it was looking for 'people with the interpersonal skills of a good bus conductor'. Graduates are beginning to apply for and be appointed to front line roles, originally more by accident than design, but are now being seen as the senior managers of the future. Companies are conscious of the need to recruit diverse workforces, and are trying to recruit an increasing proportion of women.

The police force and the public sector prison service are the main competitors for staff in post. One company is philosophical about this, saying that this demonstrates that recruits can expect to progress throughout the wider sector. Another commented on its fears of losing senior staff to public sector prisons. 'In the beginning we poached staff from the public sector, but we wouldn't do that now because our experience is that people from the public sector find it hard to adapt to the commercial realities of a private sector environment.'

### **2.6.3 Labour turnover**

Labour turnover in privately-managed establishments operated by three of the firms ranges from 10 per cent to 20 per cent across their organisations. The fourth company declined to supply this information. Turnover is highest among prison custody officers, reaching 20 per cent in one organisation. It also varies by establishment, with one employer citing a range of 6 per cent to 23 per cent.

There have been some redundancies over recent years, for example when two IRCs were merged into a cluster, but all the companies stressed that when they recruit front line staff they make it clear that these are career roles and that there are plenty of opportunities to progress through the organisation. Almost all managerial jobs are filled through internal

promotions, and one organisation said that its entire senior team had progressed up through the ranks.

#### **2.6.4 Time taken to fill roles**

The consensus among employers seemed to be that it takes three months from advertising for a role to getting a new recruit trained and able to work. This period could be cut to about six weeks if the vetting process was faster. All the companies get recruits to apply for clearance at the start of the recruitment process, but it often takes three months for the clearance to come through. Employers found this irksome.

#### **2.6.5 Future developments**

One organisation is seeking to remove the operational support grade in IRCs, as it wants all front line staff to be multi skilled.

### **3 Benchmarking**

In this section of the report we present the results of the benchmarking analyses that have been undertaken comparing the basic pay and total reward package pay for all grades of staff in private and public sector custodial services. Analyses have been undertaken separately for each of the public sector pay structures ie the closed scales and Fair and Sustainable.

#### **3.1 Technical notes**

The market summary figures for each job provide the median and interquartile salary figures. These figures show the median for each category, i.e. the median of the lower quartiles, the median of the medians, and median of the upper quartile figures for each role.

The median is obtained by arranging all observations (e.g. all salary figures) from the lowest to the highest value and selecting the middle one. If there is an even number of cases, the average of the two middle values is calculated.

The benchmark analyses undertaken in this exercise compare the public sector typical salary against the midpoint of the market salary range for each job to identify any variation. In our experience variations with a range of +/-10 per cent are not significant.

In section 3.2 we present the market summary figures for each job based on data from the private sector employers. Table 2 shows the market summary for basic pay and Table 3 shows the market summary for the total reward package.

In section 3.3 we present the market comparison. Tables 4 and 5 show the variation in basic salaries between the public (F&S and closed scales) and private sectors and Tables 6 and 7 show the variation in total reward packages between the public (F&S and closed scales) and private sectors.

## 3.2 Market summary

### 3.2.1 Basic pay

Table 2 Private sector custodial services market summary – basic pay

Role	Lower quartile £pa	Median £pa	Mean £pa	Upper quartile £pa
OSO	17,400	19,282	18,445	19,500
Prison Officer	20,982	22,137	21,627	22,368
First Line Manager	25,346	28,000	26,945	28,250
Middle Manager	32,500	34,159	34,279	37,000
SMT	45,000	46,000	45,943	46,500
Deputy Director	64,000	64,306	65,380	66,917
Director	90,000	95,000	94,370	102,000

### 3.2.2 Total reward

Table 3 Private sector custodial services market summary – total reward

Role	Lower quartile £pa	Median £pa	Mean £pa	Upper quartile £pa
OSO	17,792	19,870	19,081	20,310
Prison Officer	21,716	22,751	22,306	23,297
First Line Manager	26,014	30,003	28,433	30,271
Middle Manager	36,691	36,775	37,015	39,220
SMT	52,693	55,907	54,217	56,332
Deputy Director	73,190	78,059	81,394	78,059
Director	121,222	125,864	126,778	140,338

### 3.3 Comparisons

#### 3.3.1 Basic pay comparisons

Table 4 Benchmark comparison - basic pay, Fair and Sustainable

Band/role	Job match	Client basic £pa	Market basic £pa	£ variation	% variation
Band 2 OSG	OSO	19,138	19,282	-144	-0.7
Band 3 Prison Officer	PCO/DCO	23,734	22,137	1,598	7.2
Band 4 Supervising Officer	First line manager	30,030	28,000	2,030	7.3
Band 5 Custodial Manager	Middle manager	33,305	34,159	-854	-2.5
Band 7 Head of Function	SMT	41,810	46,000	-4,190	-9.1
Band 8 HoF/Deputy Governor	Deputy Director	50,768	64,306	-13,538	-21.1
Band 9 Deputy Governor	Director, LQ	60,074	90,000	-29,926	-33.3
Band 10 Governing Governor	Director, median	73,600	95,000	-21,400	-22.5
Band 11 Governing Governor	Director, UQ	81,088	102,000	-20,912	-20.5

Table 5 Benchmark comparison - basic pay, closed scales

Grade	Job match	Client basic £pa	Market basic £pa	£ variation	% variation
Operational Support Grade	OSO	18,943	19,282	-339	-1.8
Prison Officer	PCO/DCO	29,219	22,137	7,083	32.0
Senior Officer	First line manager	31,481	28,000	3,481	12.4
Principal Officer	Middle manager	33,872	34,159	-287	-0.8
Manager F	SMT	44,570	46,000	-1,430	-3.1
Manager E	Deputy Director	51,553	64,306	-12,753	-19.8
Senior Manager D	Director, LQ	66,567	90,000	-23,433	-26.0
Senior Manager C	Director, median	72,458	95,000	-22,542	-23.7
Senior Manager B	Director, UQ	80,458	102,000	-21,542	-21.1
Senior Manager A	Director, UQ	82,892	102,000	-19,108	-18.7

Notes for Tables 4 and 5:

- Basic pay in the public sector includes unsocial hours payments.
- The comparisons are based on the closest job matches.

### 3.3.2 Total reward

Table 6 Benchmark comparison - total reward, Fair and Sustainable

Band/role	Job match	Client basic £pa	Market basic £pa	£ variation	% variation
Band 2 OSG	OSO	22,829	19,870	2,959	14.9
Band 3 Prison Officer	PCO/DCO	28,810	22,751	6,059	26.6
Band 4 Supervising Officer	First line manager	36,452	30,003	6,449	21.5
Band 5 Custodial Manager	Middle manager	40,428	36,775	3,652	9.9
Band 7 Head of Function	SMT	51,588	55,907	-4,319	-7.7
Band 8 HoF/Deputy Governor	Deputy Director	64,164	78,059	-13,896	-17.8
Band 9 Deputy Governor	Director, LQ	75,925	121,222	-45,297	-37.4
Band 10 Governing Governor	Director, median	93,020	125,864	-32,844	-26.1
Band 11 Governing Governor	Director, UQ	104,511	140,338	-35,827	-25.5

Table 7 Benchmark comparison - total reward, closed scales

Grade	Job match	Client basic £pa	Market basic £pa	£ variation	% variation
Operational Support Grade	OSO	22,596	19,870	2,726	13.7
Prison Officer	PCO/DCO	35,468	22,751	12,717	55.9
Senior Officer	First line manager	38,349	30,003	8,346	27.8
Principal Officer	Middle manager	41,116	36,775	4,341	11.8
Manager F	SMT	60,269	55,907	4,362	7.8
Manager E	Deputy Director	70,431	78,059	-7,628	-9.8
Senior Manager D	Director, LQ	84,132	121,222	-37,091	-30.6
Senior Manager C	Director, median	91,577	125,864	-34,287	-27.2
Senior Manager B	Director, UQ	103,699	140,338	-36,639	-26.1
Senior Manager A	Director, UQ	106,836	140,338	-33,502	-23.9

Notes for Tables 6 and 7:

- The comparisons are based on the closest job matches.

Chart 1 Fair and Sustainable basic pay and Total Reward versus the private sector by band

