

**Police Staff Council
Employers' Side**

Submission to the PSC Pay and Rewards Working Party

and

response to the Trade Union Side's closing the gap submission

6th July 2005

Table of contents

Introduction	3
Background	4
Police Staff Pay.....	6
Comparison of Pay Settlements: Police, Local Government and PSC	6
Employers' Side submission on pay and rewards	7
Recruitment and retention.....	7
South East Allowance.....	8
Annual Leave	11
Performance	13
Low Pay	15
The nature and extent of the gender pay gap in the workforce.....	18
Professionalising the service.....	20
Work Life Balance	20
Proposed timetable and work programme	24
Summary of feedback from the Employers' Side regional seminars (Appendix) ..	25
PSC and LG pay survey comparison (Appendix).....	25
What is an Equality Impact Assessment (Appendix)	33

Introduction

1. This paper is the Employers' Side submission to the Police Staff Council (PSC) pay and reward working party discussions.
2. The Employers' Side of the PSC represents the Association of Police Authorities, Association of Chief Police Officers and the Home Office. As such the Employers' Side of the PSC represents the views of police authorities in their role as employers of police staff, Chief Constables in their role as managers in the police service and the Home Secretary in his role as Secretary of State responsible for policing policy impacting upon all Police Staff in England and Wales.
3. The Employers' Side of the PSC welcomes the opportunity to enter into discussion with the Trade Union side on the pay and rewards of police staff in the context of the wider workforce modernisation agenda currently taking place throughout the police service. The Employers' Side recognises the key role played by police staff within the service and feel it is necessary for the Council to take a strategic planned approach to national pay and terms and conditions in order to support the modernisation agenda. The Employers' Side is keen for joint progress to be made within the PSC pay and rewards working party that is consistent with the requirements to achieve modernisation of the service as a whole and which will be of benefit to police authorities as employers. Any changes will need to support the operational effectiveness and service delivery that is required to take police staff and the service forward to meet future challenges.
4. The Employers' Side of the PSC wants to develop modernised police workforce arrangements that support and enable neighbourhood policing and a more responsive, citizen focused police service.
5. This means a workforce that is representative of the communities it serves, is equipped with the competencies and powers need to deliver a professional and responsive service to the public and includes a diverse

range of roles and opportunities for people to develop and progress within the service.

6. The police service should be a learning organisation committed to developing the skills of all the people who work in it and supporting those who take responsibility for their own professional development, in a range of appropriate ways. Workforce arrangements should reflect the delivery of the service to the public by the police team as a whole; workforce reform including pay and reward should be developed and implemented coherently across the service.
7. There is a need to ensure any reforms to pay and reward support the operational requirements of the service and deliver value for money in terms of improved performance and the development of a professional workforce. In particular any reforms should:
 - Enable the recruitment, progression and retention of staff with the right competencies
 - Reward those who deliver national and local priorities
 - Reward in the right proportion the demands of role, skills and performance
 - Take account of the developing roles of police staff
 - Support and enable a more diverse workforce
 - Recognise accredited qualifications that contribute to effective delivery of required outcomes

Background

8. The PSC pay and rewards working party was established during 2002 with the following terms of reference.

'The PSC agreed that a Joint Pay and Reward working party should be established to look at:

- Recruitment & Retention
 - Annual Leave
 - Performance
 - The extent of low pay in the PSSC pay structure
 - The nature and extent of the gender pay gap in the workforce
 - Training & Development
 - Work Life Balance'
9. At the PSC meeting held in July 2004 the Trade Union Side tabled their submission entitled "Closing the Gap" The Employers' Side recognised this was a substantial piece of work, which they took seriously, and felt they needed to take time to fully discuss and respond to the document. During Autumn 2004 the Employers' Side agreed to undertake a consultation exercise involving all police authorities and forces. To do this, the Employers' Side organised a number of regional road shows to consult all police forces and authorities in England and Wales on the work of the Employers' Side of the PSC more generally and also to receive feedback on the Staff Side submission.

Employer consultation – road shows

10. Four regional seminars on "valuing police staff" were held at the end of November by the Employer Side. These seminars involved all the Employers' Side key stakeholders namely the Association of Police Authorities, Association of Chief Police Officers and the Home Office. There was also significant input from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, Thames Valley Police and West Midlands Police. Every force in England and Wales covered by the PSC sent at least one representative to the road shows (including those forces currently outside of the PSC framework – Surrey, Kent, City of London and Metropolitan Police).
11. A paper based consultation exercise of all forces and authorities also took place and closed in early 2005. This paper has been informed by the

consultation exercise and the road shows. As previously mentioned the paper also constitutes the Employers' Side response to the Trade Union Side's "Closing the Gap" submission. To this end a summary of the feedback from the road shows is attached at **Appendix 1**.

Police Staff Pay

12. The PSC has made progress in recent years in developing the role of the Council and this is reflected in improvements made to the PSC terms and conditions handbook and also the negotiating of competitive pay awards reached thorough the collective bargaining machinery. Below is a comparison of PSC pay awards with key comparator groups within the public sector.

Comparison of Pay Settlements: Police, Local Government and PSC

<i>Year</i>	<i>Local Govt</i>	<i>PSC</i>	<i>PNB</i>
2000	3	3.2*	3
2001	3.5	3.5	3.5
2002**	3 + 1 <i>w.e.f.Oct</i>	3.4	3
2003**	3.5	3.25	3
2004***	2.75	3	3

* ACAS arbitration award

** Part of a LGS two-year deal

*** First instalment of the LGS three-year pay agreement, worth 8.9% over the period 2004-07.

13. The Employers' Side is keen to enter into discussions with the Trade Union Side to explore improvements in the context of workforce modernisation and as such feel this paper opens up the opportunity for the Council to do this.

Employers' Side submission on pay and rewards

Recruitment and retention

14. At present there are record numbers of police staff in England and Wales – 70,000. Also, there is government commitment that there will be 24,000 Community Support Officers (CSOs) in place by 2008. Analysis of the most recent PSC Joint Survey reveals that while there may be pockets of difficulty in certain areas and for certain occupations, recruitment does not appear to be a problem for forces. Indeed police staff numbers continue to rise.
15. In the "Closing the Gap" submission (p.44), there is reference to the Audit Commission report on recruitment and retention. This report identifies four critical success factors for recruitment and retention. These are:
 - People's experience of work must match their expectations
 - The working environment must engage, enable and support staff
 - Staff need to feel valued, respected and rewarded
 - The impact on staff of the shift to a mixed economy of provision needs to be actively managed
16. The Employers' Side supports many of the findings contained in that report. However, the report states the "Public Sector" as a whole needs to improve their approach to recruitment and retention. The Employers' Side of the PSC does not have any clear evidence that there currently exists a recruitment problem within the whole of the police service or for police staff. This was borne out by the feedback from the Regional Seminars 'Valuing Police Staff'.
17. In their submission, the TU Side say that recruitment and retention problems are a result of the reward package. The Employers disagree with this assertion. In our view, the UNISON survey of 30 union branches does not provide an accurate current picture of recruitment or retention issues amongst police staff in E&W. Indeed, the survey could be interpreted as

showing that there are only isolated problems, which are best, resolved through local initiatives.

18. Turning to retention, staff turnover is the best indicator of retention problems. The TU Side submission (p.59) concedes that “staff turnover is not particularly high when compared to the public sector average of 17.4%”. The Employers’ Side is of the view that retention and turnover should be covered by the forthcoming Joint PSC survey to allow the council to monitor this issue.
19. The TU Side feel that improving annual leave entitlements would go a long way to improving staff loyalty and presumably retention. There is no evidence to support this statement. They also point to the CIPD survey which states that work life balance is a useful tool in tackling turnover problems. While annual leave and work life balance are covered in greater detail elsewhere in this paper, it can be argued that forces are currently able to improve upon current national minimum annual leave entitlement and work life balance provisions at local level and some forces have done this as part of locally negotiated agreements. Therefore to drive up the national annual leave and other terms and conditions provisions in order to improve a retention and turnover problem that does not really exist could have a negative impact on forces who have traded improved leave at local level while undermining forces who follow the national entitlement with little or no improvements on the workforce.

South East Allowance

20. The Trade Unions want to introduce the same South East allowance arrangements as currently in place for police officers. Police Officers who joined the service post 1994 currently receive a South East allowance. Officers working in the five forces bordering London receive £2,000 per annum, and officers in Bedfordshire, Hampshire and Sussex receive £1,000. This allowance was introduced to take account of the increase in London allowances introduced in the Metropolitan police, which were increased as

a direct result of previous recruitment and retention problems within London.

21. The PSC does not cover Surrey or Kent and therefore the PSC cannot introduce allowances to impact on those forces. There is no evidence of recruitment or retention problems in any of the South East forces and under the current arrangements authorities and forces can use the national spine to address local market circumstances. As a consequence the Employers' Side does not believe there is a case to introduce a South East allowance.
22. The Trade Union side's proposal appears to be based on a wish to harmonise police staff terms and conditions with those of police officers, as far as possible. The Employers' Side sees no justification for this argument. If there are isolated geographical or occupational problems with recruitment and retention the individual police authorities and forces affected have sufficient flexibility available to them in the national pay spine to deal with these.

Summary of the Trade Union Side position

23. The PSC should reflect the audit commission's report findings and the four critical success factors. The PSC needs better measurement, evaluation and diagnosis of recruitment and retention issues at both national and local level. The PSC should investigate implications of age profile and devote attention to job enrichment.

Summary of the Employers' Side position

24. The Employers' Side supports many of the findings contained in the Audit Commission report. The Employers feel that if there are any particular problems that may cause difficulties in a particular force area, there is local discretion to resolve these through the use of the flexible pay spine. Any recruitment and retention issues which may exist are unlikely to be resolved by national terms and conditions e.g. improvements to annual leave or

work life balance. The Employers' Side recognises that improvements need to be made to the PSC recruitment and retention data collection processes and would be keen to undertake a jointly agreed recruitment and retention survey. The Employers' Side is willing to explore producing guidance on recruitment and retention. Any guidance would need to be necessary, relevant and useful for authorities and forces.

Annual Leave

25. The PSC minimum annual leave entitlement is 22 days. For employees with more than five years service the minimum entitlement is 27 days. The Employers' Side feels this competitive and compares well with many of the main groups within the public sector e.g. local government, fire fighters and police officers. The PSC handbook provides for a 37-hour working week, which again compares well with other public sector groups.
26. Across the economy average leave entitlement varies by around a fifth and the length of the standard working week by nearly ten per cent across all sectors (IDS hours and holidays database). Holiday entitlements, for example, range from an average of around 21½ days in the hotels and leisure sector to more than 26 days on average in the mining, energy and water sectors.
27. The TU Side feel that variation in annual leave entitlement between different forces is unacceptable. The Employers' Side recognises that some forces have reached deals at local level to improve upon the national minimum entitlement as set out in the PSC Handbook. These local improvements are often part of the quid pro quo of local negotiations and locally reached agreements between the local parties.
28. The Employers' Side feels the current annual leave entitlement is not out of line with most parts of the public and private sector.

Comparison of Annual Leave Entitlements: Police, Police Staff, Local Government and Firefighters

<i>Years of Service</i>	<i>Number of Days Entitlement</i>			
	<i>Police Officer</i>	<i>Police Staff</i>	<i>Local Govt</i>	<i>Fire Support</i>
Under 5	23 (rising to 25 in 2006)	22	20	20
5-9	24 (rising to 25 in 2005)	27	25	25
10-14	27	27	25	25
15-19	28	27	25	25
20 or more	30	27	25	25

Note: The PSC entitlement includes 2 extra-statutory days from old Bank Holiday arrangements. PNB have recently agreed a new deal for Police Officers following lengthy negotiations and conciliation.

29. The fact that the TU Side are calling for an increase in the “minimum entitlement” means they themselves recognise that forces have the ability to move above this through local collective bargaining. Therefore there will be nothing to stop an individual police authority/force moving away from a new improved national entitlement and enhancing the new national minimum, once again causing a variation in annual leave. It appears that the TU Side are using the variation in leave across forces as an argument to drive up the current national basic entitlement. The Employers’ Side does not support this approach as a justification for changes to the current national rates of annual leave. The isolation of annual leave from all other elements of local terms and conditions packages does not provide a true reflection of this issue and a change in the national level would only undermine the positions reached through local terms and conditions negotiations. Many forces have flexitime arrangements in place, allowing staff to ‘earn’ up to 12 days off per annum. Also many control room staff do their working week over four days.

Summary of the Trade Union Side position

30. The Trade Union Side want a basic minimum entitlement of 25 days on appointment rising to 30 days after 5 years.

Summary of the Employers’ Side position

31. At present some forces may have improved the national rates of annual leave to reflect the nature of their local labour market and which takes account of differences across forces in other terms and conditions as a result of local negotiation processes.

Performance

32. The Employers' Side is keen to enter into discussions with the TU side to develop good practice guidance on a national performance pay model which supports the principle of effective performance management within the police service. The performance management system must promote and sustain workforce development.
33. The Employers' Side recognises the need to ensure performance standards across the public sector are robust and believe the current Performance Development Review (PDR) arrangements which can be applied to police staff, should continue to be developed to ensure the system operates effectively.
34. Agreements have been reached within the PNB, to link progress through the pay scales to the PDR process for certain ranks. The PDR system has been linked to pay in the senior ranks of the police services from Superintendent upwards. While the impact and outcomes are yet to be fully evaluated the Employers would like to explore developing a national performance pay model and would like to invite the Trade Union Side to enter into a time limited WP discussions to take this work forward. The aim would be to produce a joint report back to the Council by August 2006.
35. The PSC national pay system is a single national spine. While this provides forces with flexibility the spine is a time served incremental model. In section 1, paragraph 3 of the PSC handbook it states that progression will normally be by one pay point each year subject to satisfactory performance. It also allows for incremental progression to be delayed for poor performance and accelerated for excellent performance. However, there is no national model by which to guide forces on this issue and so this is managed entirely at local level.

Summary of the Trade Union Side position

36. There is no clear reference to performance management systems or performance pay within the Trade Union submission.

Summary of the Employers' Side position

37. The Employers' Side would like to explore the possibility of introducing a national model of performance related pay. This is one area the Employers' Side would be keen to explore in the joint working party along with other areas of good practice in performance management as part of this work.

Low Pay

38. There is some blurring within the TU Side submission of low pay, equal pay and equality issues. This paper separates these areas (covering equal pay and equalities elsewhere) whilst recognising that all these areas impact on the overall PSC pay system.
39. In terms of low pay the PSC Employers' Side has, in the past, rejected mixed flat rate/percentage claims from the TU Side because any evidence of recruitment difficulties, as have existed, have related to the upper end of the pay scale rather than the lower end. In general, police staff pay at the lower end of the scale has been competitive. In April 2004, according to the government's Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 40% of part-timers in the wider economy earned less than £5.71 an hour. Based on a 37-hour week, as contained in the PSC handbook, the minimum hourly rate for police staff is £5.78. The Employers' Side feels the bottom of the PSC pay spine compares favourable with the rest of the public sector and there is not a low pay problem for police staff.
40. The national minimum wage is £4.85. Under the NHS agenda for change the minimum hourly rate is £5.69. The TU side want an hourly rate of £6.50 an hour and want to delete the bottom five pay points on the PSC pay scale to achieve this. The bottom of the local govt pay scale is £5.65 per hour, which a recent local pay commission found to be competitive and justifiable. The local govt hourly rate is lower than the PSC spine.
41. Also the Trade Union Side have not made any reference in their submission to subsequent knock on effects of pay differentials for different posts, that is, internal relativities. Funding and impact on existing pay differentials are two areas that need to be considered fully when questions are asked about amending the existing pay scale and there is absence of any sophisticated evidence that proves that low pay is a problem for police staff. The Employers' Side does not feel there is any real evidence to justify altering the bottom of the pay scale.

42. The TU justifies its claim for a £6.50 minimum hourly rate on the grounds that this is the minimum paid to police staff within MPS. However, the London rate cannot be used as a bargaining counter for the rest of the country. The salaries paid by MPS reflect their specific circumstances, such as cost of living, and also recruitment and retention difficulties in the London Area. This is also recognised by the PNB police officer pay arrangements for MPS officers where they introduced a series of allowances to take account of the unique circumstances and challenges present in policing the capital and to address the recruitment and retention problem that previously existed there.
43. It would be unfair to base the national PSC pay spine on the locally negotiated pay arrangements of one or a smaller number of forces, which have specific local requirements.
44. The Trade Union Side proposed deletion of the bottom five points may have the unintended consequence of providing a strong incentive for forces to outsource many of their current in house functions e.g. catering and cleaning functions. The TU hourly rate of £6.50 is much higher than the hourly rate that is paid for these occupations elsewhere in both public and private sectors and it may weaken the chances of current employees to compete in a tendering exercise. Median basic hourly earnings for cleaners, according to the 2004 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, stood at £5.25. For catering assistants the median was £5.00 per hour. While this is not a reason in itself to not address any issues of low pay, the driving up of the bottom of the spine without any reference to labour market realities only increases costs for a number of authorities/forces and adversely impacts on those authorities/forces who have worked to keep their cleaning and catering functions in house.

Summary of the Trade Union Side position

45. The Trade Union Side has an objective of achieving a minimum PSC rate of £6.50 per hour. To achieve this the Trade Union Side wants to delete pay

points 1 to 5 on the national PSC pay spine. The new bottom point would be £12,684 at 1/9/04 rates.

Summary of the Employers' Side position

46. The Employers' Side feels there is no justification to drive up the bottom of the PSC pay spine. However, the Employers' Side does want to develop an overall employment package that is attractive to the lower and higher paid and sees the Joint Working Party's activities as providing a mechanism for doing this.

**The nature and extent of the gender pay gap in the workforce.
(Equal pay.)**

47. The Employers’ Side agrees that “pay and grading of jobs must be fair and non-discriminatory, complying with equal pay legislation and associated codes of practice”. The PSC recommends the use of a properly designed analytical Job Evaluation tool for the development of transparent and fair local pay structures.
48. The Equal Pay Act 1970 provides women (or men) a right to equal pay for equal work. Equal pay and equalities is a key area the Employers’ Side would like to engage in discussions with the Trade Union Side. The data from the most recent Joint PSC pay and numbers survey reveals the following breakdown in terms of gender:

PSC Survey 2003

PSC Pay point	FT Female	FT Male	FT Total	PT Female	PT Male	PT Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
10494 - 11634	4.6	5.1	4.8	16.0	13.2	15.6	6.9
11943 - 14487	45.7	31.3	39.8	54.4	44.2	53.2	42.3
14793 - 20379	37.8	40.6	39.0	24.9	33.0	25.9	36.5
21135 - 24528	7.3	12.7	9.5	3.1	7.1	3.6	8.4
25170 - 35658	4.5	10.2	6.9	1.6	2.6	1.8	5.9

49. The Employers’ Side has put together data comparing the position of police staff with the biggest group of workers within the public sector, the 1.5 million local government workers. This is attached at **Appendix 2**. The Employers’ Side agrees that any pay inequality between men and women police staff must be removed. However, the concentration of women in lowest paid jobs does not, in itself, prove that there is any down valuing of work. Other explanations are possible.
50. The Employers’ Side is willing to undertake a joint equal pay audit of forces and produce a report to the PSC for consideration at the earliest opportunity. As part of this work the Employers’ Side feels that equality

impact assessments are essential to ensuring that all future proposals, including any on pay, are neither directly or indirectly discriminatory and that such proposals actively take on board equalities considerations in their development. Whilst many forces already have very sound Job Evaluation schemes, the Employers' Side is willing to discuss reviewing the PSC recommended 13 factor Job Evaluation and explore updating the guidance.

Summary of the Trade Union Side position

51. Elimination of pay discrimination in the police service should be a PSC priority. Forces should use the PSC 13 factor JE scheme. Forces should carry out Equal Pay Audits in line with EOC guidance. PSC should draw up an action plan to coordinate the equal pay proofing of police force pay systems.

Summary of the Employers' Side position

52. The Employers' Side would like to establish a Joint working party on equal pay and equalities and have put together a without commitment draft of a statement on equality impact assessments attached at **Appendix 3**. We would also like to develop an Equality Standard for adoption by the PSC.

Professionalising the service

53. The Police Service should be a learning organisation committed to developing the skills of all the people who work for it. A coherent approach means developing learning and development, pay, progression etc into a genuine career framework for the entire police team. This means providing the tools and knowledge necessary for members of service to plan their own learning and development.
54. Performance and development reviews are critical to this. Implementation varies throughout the service but the Employers' Side recognises that this is an essential performance management tool. The Skills for Justice's integrated competency framework is the tool for clearly defined role profiles for officers and staff that link directly to the national occupational standards. We need to work with Skills for Justice and all stakeholders to ensure that forces have the knowledge and skills they need to make PDRs work.
55. There is a need to break down barriers between roles and provide powers and training appropriate to the particular role. We need to make it possible for people to plan a route into, through and, where they want to, out of the service. Training and development is therefore a key element of workforce reform
56. The Employers' Side feels that the PSC should undertake work on the current training and development opportunities in place for police staff. The Employers' Side supports the need to ensure that police staff receive fair and equal access to relevant high quality training and development.
57. The Employers' Side would like to set up a working party with the Trade Union side to discuss skills/career framework and professional development, explore where any development gaps may exist e.g. skills of middle managers that are required to adequately support staff. We would

also like to explore the extension of the Higher Potential Development Scheme to include staff.

58. The Employers' Side would also like to discuss the possibility of introducing regional HPDS as a joint venture with other forces and the wider criminal justice sector.
59. The Employers' Side acknowledges that particularly for specialist areas, opportunities do not always exist for those staff wishing to move rapidly. There may be a case to explore training and development for police staff within the service beyond individual authority and force level, e.g. at a regional level, and wider than just the police service in order to tap into other related markets, such as other forces, other central government, or private sector.

Summary of the Trade Union position

60. There should be Home Office investment in training to support modernisation along the lines of the NHS. There should be an equality audit of police staff training opportunities.

Summary of the Employers' Side position

61. The Employers' Side believes that training and development is a key element of workforce reform and would like to engage with the Trade Unions to discuss PSC joint guidance on this.

Work Life Balance

62. The Employers' Side supports Work/Life balance options, which enable police forces to implement and continuously improve sustainable work-life strategies. These strategies should in turn meet the customer needs of forces, corporate goals and enhance the quality of life for all members of police staff.
63. The Employers' Side recognises that many forces have reached agreements locally to introduce local WLB initiatives to suit local circumstances. The Employers support this approach while recognising that more could be done at national level to promote and develop a WLB strategy that will support members of police staff to adjust their working patterns to combine work with their other responsibilities.
64. The TU side have drawn up a list of improvements to terms and conditions under the heading of WLB. The Employers' Side does not feel that the best approach to WLB is to drive up various national agreements. The Employers' Side favours a national WLB framework, which would allow forces to target their own local initiatives to suit their own local WLB circumstances.
65. The Employers' Side would like to establish a clearer picture of the range of work/life balance initiatives in place across the country. We would also like to get a better feel for current levels of overtime working, use of time off for emergencies involving children and dependents, levels of employee stress, rates of absenteeism and turnover. This information could be used to inform work on a PSC national WLB strategy.

Summary of the Trade Union position

66. To jointly draw up a work life balance strategy. Reach a model agreement on a PSC career break scheme, flexible working, 10 days paid maternity support leave, parental leave, first day half day for parents, use of holiday pay schemes, minimum child care subsidy etc.

Summary of the Employers' Side position

67. The Employers' Side is keen to enter discussions with the TU Side to explore guidance on work life balance strategies that will support the work already being undertaken at local level. The Employers' side wants to explore agreeing best practice advice to encourage those forces, which have not already done so, to introduce WLB initiatives that will benefit both employees and employers within the police service.

Proposed timetable and work programme

68. Whilst the work of the Working Party needs to be owned by the full PSC, it is proposed that a smaller group, made up of three nominees from each side, carries out the more detailed work.
69. We would suggest that this smaller group meets for the first time in August/September following completion of this year's pay negotiations. At that meeting the group should agree a programme of work, which should be brought back to the full PSC for endorsement. In order to ensure that work can commence as quickly as possible, we would suggest that this endorsement might be obtained by email.
70. We would also propose that the group agrees a set of dates for subsequent meetings that fits in with the PSC cycle.

PSC EMPLOYER SIDE JULY 2005

APPENDIX 1

Summary of feedback from the Employers' Side regional seminars

Background

The four Employer Side regional seminars were held during November 2004 in London 11th, Bristol 19th, Birmingham 26th, and Manchester 29th. All forces/authorities in England and Wales (although two were unable to send a representative on the day due to late unavoidable commitments) were represented. In total 110 delegates attended the four seminars. This summary briefly touches on the main issues, views and comments made by the delegates and speakers.

General

Overall forces were supportive of the current national pay and bargaining arrangements and supported the freedoms available to them through the flexible national pay spine. There was no real appetite for greater central control on pay and while forces were supportive of the use of JE schemes there was no support for a single national JE scheme (as in NHS).

There was some support for further central guidance on good practice in terms of other conditions issues, such as flexible working. Some felt that there is a key role for the PSC in providing a framework for forces to work within.

Welcomed the wider remit of the council and generally supported the PSC advisory role and recommendation that PSC should become part of the PAB structure. Clarification is required as to how PSC involvement with PAB will work in practice e.g. enhance PAB to cover PSC or for issues discussed at PAB to also be discussed within PSC Joint meetings. It was agreed that discussions to take this forward should take place between all the key stakeholders at the earliest opportunity.

Employers keen to stress that any negotiation of particular terms and conditions and any comparisons made by the Staff Side to those of officers are partial and

should be done holistically - i.e. take into account the full package for officers which includes no strike agreement, increased risk, cancellation of leave etc.

Concern that forces who are ahead of the game in developing and negotiating local improvements could suffer more than others if Employers moved towards the Staff Side's "cherry picking" proposals on the so called terms and conditions "lottery".

Concern that any changes would need funding and at present this does not appear to be available.

Some delegates did argue for national pay spines for certain very specialist roles but did not elaborate. Delegates expressed interest on different pay rates across the country and in particular regarding the information on the different pay rates of CSOs across the country. It was felt it may be useful to explore these as part of the pay and rewards working party.

Agreement that PSC handbook could be expanded and developed to include more guidance, best practice and information on key areas of conditions such as career breaks, family friendly policies, and rostering.

Scope for PSC and police service to think innovatively about new ways of working, such as honorariums for staff e.g. administrative etc and those who are PCSOs, shadowing other areas.

Low Pay

On the whole there was no support on the assertion from the Staff Side that low pay was a problem for police staff. No desire to remove bottom points of pay scale and forces authorities recognised that the bottom of the national pay spine was well above national minimum wage and key public sector comparators such as local government and NHS agenda for change arrangements.

Equal pay

Strong objections to introduction of new nationally agreed JE scheme, but perhaps some scope to introduce a voluntary tool which forces can adopt incrementally and adapt for own needs (Hay mentioned here). This would be implemented on a very long-term basis. Feedback suggested that forces are at different stages on Equal Pay audits.

Retention

Only seen as an issue for a minority of highly specialised staff roles. Gaps in management data as length of service for police staff not collected as part of the Home Office Annual Data Requirement or the Employer Side pay and numbers survey. Some forces indicated that this data is collected locally.

Confirmed that the Employer Side should challenge the Staff Side claim that low morale is prevalent and impacting on retention. Some forces/authorities felt that a certain rate of movement (e.g. 5-10%) is actually healthy as it can bring in employees with new enthusiasm and talent e.t.c. Overall feeling that police staff seen as less flexible than police officers in terms of their willingness to move posts, or make geographical moves

Annual leave

There was no need or justification to increase national annual leave arrangements for staff above that of police officers as this could cause escalation of officer rates. Police officer bank holiday arrangements for when the bank holiday falls at a weekend were felt to be too generous and out of line with the rest of the public sector.

Regional Allowances/Pay

There was no support for the introduction of regional allowances e.g. South East allowance. The flexible pay spine allows forces to take account of market forces. It was felt that regional allowances are often crude, and can impact on all jobs and not just those that are not subject to market forces.

Performance Pay

Performance is part of the pay and rewards terms of reference, and was previously very much part of the Employer Side agenda, and at the recent seminars delegates heard a presentation from Thames Valley (TVP) and West Midlands regarding innovative approaches local pay systems and expressed particular interest in guidance on a performance pay model. It was felt that national guidance and examples that could be accessed electronically, on a website, would prove useful.

Linking pay and performance was also an area identified for development, although very reliant on making major improvements to the implementation of PDRs

Training and professional development and career pathways

There was support for work around improving opportunities for development, training and career pathways. Generally felt that while initial training for police staff roles generally comprehensive, some felt there was not always enough follow up on development. Major gap seen in skills of middle managers that are required to adequately support staff

Some support for widening higher potential development scheme to include staff, and to create multiple entry points for officers. Regional higher potential development scheme floated as an idea as a joint venture with other forces and the wider Criminal Justice Sector.

Some believe that particularly for specialist areas, opportunities do not always exist for those staff wishing to move rapidly. Service as a whole could and should look wider than individual forces, e.g. at a regional level, and wider than just the police service in order to tap into other related markets, such as other forces, other central government, or private sector. The police service should develop more scope for joint training and support for foundation training for police staff.

Appendix 2

EQUAL PAY

Comparison of finding from the Police Support Staff Council and the Single Status Pay Surveys of 2003

PSC Survey

The Police Support Staff Council survey was conducted in early 2003. The forms were despatched to the 41 forces covering England and Wales excluding the City of London and Metropolitan Police Forces.

The survey had two main parts, pay and workforce issues. The pay survey consisted of a census of employment for employees on both the PSSC pay spine and those being paid on local pay rates, and a sample earnings survey of employees on the PSSC pay spine. Gender data was only collected on the pay survey.

The workforce survey consisted of a questionnaire relating to workforce issues and a pay & benefits survey for a number of key posts.

Response Rate

27 out of 41 forces responded to the pay survey giving a 66% overall response rate, however if the forces outside of the national agreement are disregarded then the response rate is 69%.

Survey Findings

Census of Employment by PSSC Pay Spine Point:

The census counted 30,121 full-time employees, 7,111 part-time employees and 33,888 full-time equivalents (FTEs) being paid on the PSSC pay spine in the 27 respondent forces. The average FTE salary of these employees was £16,573.

If the survey is grossed up on the basis of the responses received to represent a 100% response rate the FTE figure would be 47,421 and the average salary would be £16,617.

Census of Employment by Annual Salary (*Staff on local pay rates and those earning more than £35,658*):

There were 1,489 full-time employees, 236 part-time employees and 1,608 FTEs being paid on local pay rates and above £35,658 in the 27 respondent forces. Of that number 1,127 full-time employees, 210 part-time employees and 1,226 FTEs were being paid below £35,658 with 362 full-time employees, 26 part-time employees and 382 FTEs above it. There was not enough data available to enable us to gross up the local figures.

Earnings of a Sample of Employees on the PSSC Pay Spine:

Information was collected for 1,075 full-time and 253 part-time employees. The information was in relation to the pay period including 12 November 2002. The average weekly basic salary for full-time employees was £321.65 and their overall total weekly earnings were £364.69. The average weekly basic salary for part-time employees was £154.16 and their overall total weekly earnings were £173.93. There was not a big enough sample to enable us to produce statistically viable data by gender.

SS Survey

The survey was conducted in June 2003, forms were sent to all local authorities in England, Wales & Northern Ireland and to all fire and joint authorities in England & Wales.

The survey consisted of a census survey of employment by spinal column point which gathered the following information; numbers on each SCP, those above SCP 49 and locally paid employees by full-time and part-time by gender and ethnic origin, and FTEs.

Response Rate

A total of 481 forms were despatched of which 312 were completed giving a response rate of 65%.

Survey Findings

All of the survey findings 'grossed' to represent a 100% response. In June 2003 there were over 1.3 million employees within scope of the agreement, according to the survey estimate. This consists of 592,692 full-time employees (344,399 females and 248,293 males) and 709,937 part-time employees (646,795 females and 63,142 males). The overall full-time equivalent total was 878,357 employees. The average FTE salary of these employees was £16,573.

Comparisons between the two surveys

The following tables show the distribution of employees by gender by pay point groupings from both surveys.

PSC Survey 2003

PSC Pay point	FT Female	FT Male	FT Total	PT Female	PT Male	PT Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
10494 - 11634	4.6	5.1	4.8	16.0	13.2	15.6	6.9
11943 - 14487	45.7	31.3	39.8	54.4	44.2	53.2	42.3
14793 - 20379	37.8	40.6	39.0	24.9	33.0	25.9	36.5
21135 - 24528	7.3	12.7	9.5	3.1	7.1	3.6	8.4
25170 - 35658	4.5	10.2	6.9	1.6	2.6	1.8	5.9

Single Status Survey 2003

LGS SCP	FT Female	FT Male	FT Total	PT Female	PT Male	PT Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
10521 - 11706	11.9	21.1	15.8	53.6	55.9	53.8	36.5
11949 - 14532	28.9	15.2	23.2	32.4	24.2	31.6	27.8
14817 - 20469	33.9	26.4	30.8	10.2	12.9	10.5	19.7
21282 - 24726	12.6	14.7	13.5	2.0	3.4	2.1	7.3
25245 - 35934	12.7	22.6	16.8	1.9	3.7	2.0	8.8

The tables below show the average and the median salaries by gender and full and part time employees from both surveys

Average salaries p.a.	FT Female	FT Male	FT All	FTE All
PSC Survey	16,158	17,816	16,841	16,617
SS Survey	17,784	19,185	18,371	16,737

Median salaries p.a.	FT Female	FT Male	% F of M	PT Female	PT Male	% F of M	FTE All
PSC Survey	14,487	16,404	88.3	14,178	14,487	97.9	14,793
SS Survey	16,515	18,012	91.7	11,361	11,361	100.0	14,532

The proportion of female employees found in the two surveys is shown in the table below.

% Females	Full-time	Part-time	All
PSC Survey	58.8	87.5	64.2
SS Survey	58.1	91.1	76.1

The proportion of employees who were full and part time is shown in this final table.

% FT/PT	Full-time	Part-time
PSC Survey	81.1	18.9
SS Survey	45.5	54.5

Appendix 3

Draft without commitment

Equality Impact Assessments (EqIAs)

Introduction

The police staff terms and conditions handbook states, that “pay and grading of jobs must be fair and non-discriminatory, complying with equal pay legislation and associated codes of practice”. As part of the PSC pay and rewards working party discussions on equal pay and equalities, the PSC supports the need for police authorities and forces to conduct Equality Impact Assessments (EqIAs) of any new proposals or any proposed changes to existing terms and conditions.

The PSC believes that undertaking EqIAs is essential to ensuring that new proposals:

- are not directly or indirectly discriminatory;
- actively take on board equalities considerations in their development.

The PSC believes that it is important that police forces and authorities and trade unions jointly undertake EqIAs in the spirit of partnership working. Both Employers and Unions should be jointly involved in the process from the outset.

This statement deals with carrying out EqIAs on proposals which impact on employment and pay and conditions for police staff covered by the PSC terms and conditions handbook. These will include specific proposals on changes to employment and pay and conditions and changes made for other reasons (for example, to implement Government and Home Office requirements) that in effect change pay, conditions or other working arrangements.

What is an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)?

An EqIA is a systematic method of assessing and recording the likely differential impact of proposed policies, initiatives or changes to services/procedures on equality target groups in the workforce or in the community. The aim is to try to

anticipate any adverse impacts and amend the proposals to deal with them. The EqlA method can be used to review existing policies, as part of an audit of current procedures and practices, but is normally used (particularly by the Equalities Commissions), to refer to the assessment of proposed or new policies.

Differential impact suggests that a target equality group is likely to be affected differently by a proposal - negatively, neutrally or positively. Adverse impact is an indication that the impact is less favourable and potentially unlawful in relation to the target equality groups. An impact that is adverse, but not on equality grounds would normally be dealt with as a collective bargaining issue.

The particular aim of an EqlA is to identify proposals where the impact is unlawful or otherwise unjustifiable. However, with the positive duty for race and the forthcoming positive duties for gender and disability, EqlAs will also identify those proposals that will have a positive impact by improving outcomes for various groups or community.

EqlAs are essentially a form of risk assessment. By carrying out an EqlA before proposals are finalised, a police authority is likely to avoid introducing policies or procedures that could turn out later to have a negative impact and/or to be indirectly discriminatory.

Why Undertake an EqlA?

The PSC is keen to adopt good practice around equal pay and equalities as a whole and are keen that police authorities forces carrying out local pay and grading reviews should also carry out an EqlA of the *proposed* changes to pay, grading and conditions which emerge from the review. This should be completed by work also being discussed by the PSC around the conduct of equal pay audits, which assess the impact of *current* pay and grading structures and policies on men and women.

Good practice overall is to conduct EqlAs for all proposed changes which impact on employment and pay and conditions as a matter of course.

Who should be covered?

EqlAs should be used to assess the relative impact of proposals on the terms and conditions of the relevant target groups with respect to:

Gender

Race

Disability

Sexual Orientation

Religion or Belief

Age

Main Occupational Groups/Part time staff.

The first five groups are already covered by relevant equalities legislation and age legislation will be enacted in 2006. Police authorities and forces should also consider whether proposed changes will disproportionately affect occupational groups which are predominantly male or female, or part time, to avoid indirect gender discrimination.

Carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment

Key stages and questions

The EqlA has three main stages.

Stage 1 - Scope of the assessment

What are the aims and objectives of the proposal?

How does the policy/proposed change fit in with the police authority's objectives?

Which group or groups of employees are affected by this proposal?

Stage 2 - Assessment of impact

What information on the likely impact of the proposal is available from current data?

What are the views of key stakeholders?

How is it likely to affect the target equality groups?

Is there any evidence that this proposal will have a differential impact on any of the target equality groups?

In what way?

Stage 3 – Decision and recommendations

Is there an adverse impact on any of the target groups?

If so, can the proposal be changed to remove the impact?

Can the negative consequences be counter-balanced by other measures?

If not, are there alternative measures that would achieve the objectives without an adverse impact?

If not, can the proposed changes be justified on grounds that they are intended to promote equality of opportunity?

If yes, for what reasons?

Could the proposal lead to unlawful direct discrimination? If yes, you must abandon it straightaway and look for different ways of achieving your policy; direct discrimination can never be justified. Reject the proposal.

Could the proposal lead to unlawful indirect discrimination? If yes, you should look for different ways of achieving your aims. If you decide the potential for indirectly discriminating against some groups is justifiable, you should make sure your reasons have nothing to do with race, gender, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, age or main occupational groups/part time staff. You would be well advised to seek legal advice on the question of justifiability. This is a difficult area of law.

Agree and publish/formally record decision on proposal/policy with justification (if required), including the relative weight given to the evidence and the reasons for the decision.

Make arrangements for jointly monitoring and evaluating the policy and its impact as part of regular audits.