



POLICE AUTHORITIES OF WALES
Submission to the Independent Review of Police
Officers and Staff Remuneration and Conditions

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Police Authorities of Wales (PAW) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Government’s Review of Remuneration and Conditions of Service for Police Officers and Staff.
- 1.2 Police Authorities of Wales (PAW) is a representative body of the four Police Authorities in Wales: Gwent Police Authority, Dyfed-Powys Police Authority, North Wales Police Authority and South Wales Police Authority. The main aims of PAW are to:
- Consider and act upon issues affecting policing in Wales, particularly those that are under the control of the National Assembly for Wales.
 - Maintain a broad Welsh prospectus on police matters.
 - Promote and protect the interests of member Authorities.
 - Seek to influence the policing agenda at a national level on behalf of Police Authorities and local communities in Wales.
 - Support Police Authorities in securing efficient and effective policing services across Wales.
 - Enable Police Authorities to improve.
 - Promote awareness of policing needs and the role and achievements of Police Authorities.
 - Uphold and champion the principles of local accountability and policing by consent.
- 1.3 As an overview, Police Authorities have a statutory responsibility for:
- Ensuring the police provide an efficient and effective service.
 - Setting the local policing priorities based on consultation with local people.
 - Managing the police budget including setting the police part of the council tax in consultation with local people.
 - Recruitment of the Chief Constable and the Chief Officers
 - Monitoring police performance, holding the Chief Constable to account on behalf of the public.
 - Ensuring that the Chief Constable delivers a police service that balances both national strategic priorities with the concerns of local people.

- Monitoring complaints against the police.
- Promoting equality and good relations between different groups of people. Informing people of their rights if they are stopped and searched by the police.

2. Conclusion

- 2.1 Police Authorities of Wales is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the review of remuneration and conditions of service for police officers and staff, and hopes that our comments are helpful. PAW would be happy to provide further information which may be of benefit. If you would like further information about any of the points raised or have any questions please direct them to Mr. Tal Michael Chief Executive of North Wales Police Authority:

Mr. Tal Michael,
North Wales Police Authority
Police Headquarters
Glan-y-Don
Colwyn Bay
LL29 8AW
Tal.Michael@nthwales.pnn.police.uk
Phone: (01492) 804780

**Submission to the Independent Review of Police
Officers and Staff Remuneration and Conditions
from Police Authorities of Wales (PAW)**

Table of Contents

1) Management Structure.....	4
2) Entry Routes.....	5
3) Transparency.....	6
4) Pay Scales for Police Constables.....	7
5) Hazardous duties	8
6) Civilianisation.....	8
7) Police staff.....	8
8) Flexibility	8
9) Chief Officers (ACPO rank).....	9

1) Management Structure

The Office of Constable should remain at the centre of the British model of policing. The competencies expected in this role and the rewards received for the role should be at the heart of the review.

The structure of policing is currently one with very low staff to manager ratios. Nationally the ratios are as follows:

		Indicative	Staff/ Manager Ratio	
ACPO	0.20%	3		
Chief Superintendent	0.30%	5		
Superintendent	0.70%	11		
Supt (inc Chief)	1.0%	15	5	Supts (inc CSupts) per ACPO Officer
Chief Inspector	1.30%	20		
Inspector	4.70%	71		
Insp (inc Chief Insp)	6.0%	90	6	Inspectors (inc CIs) per Supt/ Ch Supt
Sergeant	13.90%	209	2	Sergeants per Inspector/ Ch Inspector
Constable	69.10%	1,037	5	Constables per Sergeant
PCSO	9.90%	149		
Force total	100.00%	1,500		

Source: HMIC VFM Profiles. The "indicative" column seeks to put some reality on the percentages (for smaller forces).

Police Officers make independent decisions on a daily basis, and in many respects can be regarded as managers in their own right, as they manage themselves and work with volunteers and PCSOs, for instance, in addition to being supported and guided by the management structure. However, the management structure, when broken down into ratios (e.g. number of constables per sergeant) does make the organisation seem 'top heavy' in comparison to what might be expected.

The table aids in asking the question: if we expect (and reward in terms of pay) officers to make independent decisions, then why are the ratio's so high for managers per officer.

A higher ratio of staff to manager would be consistent with the Government's desire to reduce bureaucracy and shift resources to the front line. It also places a greater emphasis on getting things right first time instead of relying on management supervision to correct mistakes. It would therefore be appropriate to accompany a slimmer structure with more rigorous testing to ensure that all ranks continue to maintain the expected level of competence and to include a longer developmental phase before a new recruit attains the full status of constable. This implies a move away from the current one way promotional ladder to a structure which reflects the abilities of individuals and needs of the organisation as they change over time.

Recommendation: The review should examine how these supervision ratios compare to other professions and recommend an appropriate average, which would then be adapted to local circumstances by Chief Constables.

2) Entry Routes

Diversity of entrants into the policing service is critical to ensuring a healthy workforce and, in turn, positive relations with the communities they police. Significant progress has been made in recent years in attracting greater numbers of females, Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and other underrepresented groups into the service. However there is still room for improvement in enhancing the diversity and we believe this is most appropriately done by continuing to improve engagement at local level, rather than nationally set targets.

The Single entry route to becoming a police officer is both a strength and a weakness within the service:

Strengths:

- Ensures all police officer ranks have experience of front line policing
- Balances the need for formal accreditation (i.e. promotion exams) with actual experience

Weaknesses:

- May act as a financial barrier for those already in employment to be attracted to become an officer
- Does not provide Officers with the opportunity to be recognized for the qualifications, skills or employment experience that they bring into the role (which may also include policing experience as PCSOs, Police Staff or Specials).

Diversity within the service is not solely an issue based on the strands of diversity (i.e. gender, race, sexual orientation, language), it is also a matter of widening the socio-economic backgrounds, employment and life experiences people bring into the service. We believe that there is merit in exploring the possibility of enhancing fast track schemes within the service to balance the need for front line policing experience and the requirement to enrich the service with people with different life and work experiences.

Currently Members of the Special Constabulary and Police and Community Support Officers (PCSOs) are not guaranteed any recognition of their previous contribution to the service if they decide to apply to become Police Officers. Although some objected to the idea, PCSOs have come to be accepted as a valued addition to the policing family. It is opportune to consider the development, role and responsibilities of PCSOs in greater depth as part of this review.

An additional consideration that needs highlighting, although only indirectly relevant, is the current inability of applicants to undertake assessment for becoming an officer in the Welsh Language. Currently it is only possible to submit an application form in Welsh, all activities in the assessment centre are English language only and this should be addressed.

Recommendation:

A compromise between maintaining the integrity of the office of constable by ensuring all officers have front line policing experience and recognising previous achievements would be to develop fast track schemes for a wider audience than graduates alone.

The review should consider the development, role and responsibilities of PCSOs within the policing family in greater depth.

3) Transparency

There should be a move away from the complex arrangements which make up the remuneration package of individual officers including bonuses, Special Priority Payments and payments for providing mutual aid to another force. Within the revised framework, there should be capacity for greater rewards to those officers taking on high risk and/or highly skilled roles.

The risk of exposure to harm while carrying out duties is one that is strongly associated with policing, and is often cited as a reason for increasing the pay and reward given to officers and why they require particular conditions of service. However, danger is only one dimension of the job that affects pay level – and not all officers face the same risks.

One of the challenges in accurately comparing Police Officer pay is the relative lack of transparency of the salary in comparison to the actual earnings that can be provided to officers over a year's service.

Officers may be entitled to claim or be awarded additional remuneration dependent on additional days worked, duties undertaken (SPP payments) and other financial compensation schemes. In reality, this means that some officers, on taking promotion to a Sergeant or Inspector, can take an actual reduction in financial reward received for their service, which can create a disincentive to seek promotion. Nor is there a clear read-through from the level of risk or skills involved in a specialist role and the reward package.

It is appropriate to allow Chief Constables the flexibility to pay overtime where additional hours are required, but this should be used for genuinely exceptional circumstances not as a financial reward for undertaken anti-social hours for example.

Recommendation: The review examines ways to aid the policing service to move towards a simpler and more transparent pay system, and that the review conducts comparisons between what is listed as an officer salary on the pay scale at present and compares it to average actual earnings (or a sample of earnings) received by police officers at present.

4) Pay Scales for Police Constables

The Police Force, in particular the Office of Constable, differs significantly to some areas of public and private sector employment. From September 2010, PCs will attract a starting salary of £23,259 and rise annually thereafter along 10 spinal points on the pay grade system:

	Pay (September 2010)	Increase
Starting salary	£23,259	
1	£25,962	£2,703
2	£27,471	£1,509
3	£29,148	£1,677
4	£30,066	£918
5	£31,032	£966
6	£31,917	£885
7	£32,703	£786
8	£33,753	£1,050
9	£35,796	£2,043
10	£36,519	£723

There is a lack of consistency across the increments in terms of the actual financial increase. More importantly, the rationale for increasing pay and reward based on time served is very limited. It would make far more sense to have developmental grades prior to attaining full competence and for further enhancements to be based on the type of duties undertaken, additional skills gained to aid the organisation and so on. The Fire Service recognises different development stages of becoming a competent fire-fighter:

Fire-fighter – Pay scale	Fire (Correct as of 2009)
Trainee	£21,157
Development	£22,038
Competent	£28,199

This allows the employer to recognise the different developmental stages of fire-fighters and base their financial reward on this basis rather than solely on length of service. The current Personal Development Review (PDR) programme is not robust enough to support the accession through the scales, as it is seen as a given that an officer will increase annually rather than dependent on PDR performance. The PDR system needs to become more robust and reach a better balance between providing evidence of performance and bureaucracy.

Recommendation: The pay review should consider the merits and financial implications of adopting competence based pay rather than based on length of service. Options to be considered should include the model utilised by the Fire Service, for PCs, whereby there are five substantive grades (rather than the 10 plus trainee level there are at present). The grades should broadly reflect the following criteria:

- Trainee
- Developmental
- Competent
- High Risk
- Specialist

5) Hazardous duties

When undertaking hazardous duties in a work capacity, individuals (usually uniformed) may invalidate their personal insurance with possibly serious consequences. This requires a national solution as a matter of urgency, to ensure that an employee carrying out such duties and, in particular those trained to deal with chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear hazards, know that their families will be economically secure if something happens to them.

Recommendation: For a national solution to be achieved to ensure that employees undertaking hazardous duties have alternative cover if their personal insurance becomes invalid due to the nature of their duties

6) Civilianisation

There should be an assumption that specialist roles which do not require a warranted officer should be performed by civilians. The rates of pay should be based on comparability with the roles performed in other sectors. Too often, the fact that experience as a police officer is valuable in a particular role, is confused with the requirement for a particular role to be a warranted officer – the human resources function being a good example. Flexibility in the employment terms for police officers (see below) is the appropriate mechanism for making use of this experience, rather than having warranted officers in such roles.

7) Police staff

Police staff are essential in carrying out roles which require certain skills and experience (Accounts, Crime Scene Investigators, Occupational Health Specialists, Pilots, Custody Detention Officers and Force Medical Advisors for example). They provide a means of ensuring that roles are more effectively filled when there is a requirement for key skills but not a warrant card. Currently, there are differences throughout forces and authorities in England and Wales to the salary awarded to posts which have similar duties attached. There needs to be flexibility for forces to adapt to the local employment market in order to attract suitable people into posts, and there should also be scope to recognise local differences in the duties performed within the role. However, there is a clear case to standardise the salary awarded to roles across England and Wales which undertake the same duties, and there is potentially a case for some salaries to be compared to other public sector organisations (such as local government) where similar roles are undertaken.

Recommendation: To explore the feasibility of creating nationally defined salaries for staff roles which have generic or similar duties across forces.

8) Flexibility

The current terms and conditions assume that police officers commence their policing career in their twenties, progress through the ranks on the basis of their ability and then retire in their fifties. This does not fit with other professions and is no longer appropriate.

The possibility of moving to average rather than final salary as the basis for pension should be explored as part of a wider review of pension arrangements for police

officers, exploring the years of service before full pension is earned, the rate of pension payment, etc. Chief Officers should be required to work until a later age and a review undertaken of whether a full pension should be payable on completion of 30 years service (or 35 if they have joined the service in more recent years). The current practice of re-employing retired police officers should be re-evaluated within the context of the pension payments, with a view to either limiting the maximum salary earnable in civilian employment or delayed or staggered growth of pension for instance.

Recommendation: The review should consider the merits of the following in order to increase flexibility within the workforce:

- Pensions paid when someone reaches pensionable age rather than when they leave the service – so the assumption would be that someone in their fifties who retires from the police service will take another job and won't be able to access their pension for ten or more years
- Making policing attractive on the basis of a ten or twenty year career and being able to leave and come back (or move to and from a civilian role within the police service)
- Creating tools to enable adjustments to the workforce through voluntary redundancy (and/or inducement to step down to a more junior rank)
- End to one-way career ladder – so that someone can move down the ranks as well as up and across the organisation, depending on the level of responsibility they wish to take and the competences they are assessed as having, and the needs of the organisation
- Pensions based on average salary rather than final salary (which is fairer as well as enabling the move away from a one-way career ladder)

Some of these changes would have significant implications for serving officers. It is essential that in implementing changes, this is considered and that a new system is not introduced retrospectively.

9) Chief Officers (ACPO rank)

Similar to the views expressed in relation to Police Constables, we would like to see a greater transparency within the remuneration packages associated with the posts of Chief Officers. The Chief Officer bonus schemes should be brought to an end as there are significant differences across Authorities and Forces in the way these bonuses are awarded and the ease with which the performance criteria can be met. There is a danger that this becomes a game where Chief Officers have a perverse incentive to ensure that they are able to exceed targets. At the level of payment ACPO Officers receive, the bonus should not be needed and in view of the cuts which we are facing, it would be one small saving, but a very clear statement on fairness in terms of remuneration.

It would be better to focus the appraisal system on setting challenging targets and monitoring whether they are met. Performance criteria for the Chief Officers should

be retained but this should be considered part of their role and the opportunity to attract a bonus should not be an incentive in its own right.

The recruitment pool of Chief Officers has had its problems well documented by the APA and other Authorities. The sector should exercise a degree of restraint in agreeing pay and rewards for the Chief Officers, which has been murky in recent years, as additional benefits have been tied to posts in order to try and attract candidates to peripheral or areas which have had difficulties in recruiting Chief Officers in the past. This has inflated the remuneration awarded to Chief Officers in an indirect (although occasionally direct) way.

The financial incentive to apply to become an Assistant Chief Constable (ACC) in comparison to the salary awarded to Chief Superintendents is not substantial, and the salary changes associated with rising to Deputy Chief Constable (DCC), and Chief Constable (CC) level are equally fluid. This, in turn, may be a barrier for Chief Officers to move to different forces to seek promotion, unless the forces are within commutable distances. We would like to see the removal of the requirement for a prospective Chief Constable to have served as a Chief Officer in another force, before being eligible as a candidate for become Chief Constable.

There should also be a review of the fixed term contract arrangements for CC and DCC. At present, the Officer can walk away from a fixed term contract with no penalty, and this is problematic for both the Authority and the Force. There should be a requirement for officers to commit to and remain in post for the full period, unless exceptional circumstances arise.

Recommendation:

To end the bonus schemes for Chief Officers.

To improve transparency in pay and reward packages offered to Chief Officers.

To remove the requirement for a candidate for the position of Chief Constable to have served as a Chief Officer in another force.

To review the contractual arrangements for CC and DCC