

---

## PAY AND CONDITIONS

Version 2

### 1. Policy statement

Pay and conditions of service for police officers should support the advancement of a police service that is representative of the public it serves. The pay system should attract and retain officers of differing genders, ethnicity and age groups.

PFEW believes that overall police officer pay should be determined nationally so as to support operational demands, deployability, and mutual aid, and that any changes to pay and conditions should be based on evidence of need. Pay should adequately reward the job undertaken.

### 2. Responsibility

The National Board is responsible for all policy formation.

### 3. Summary

We believe there is a need to ensure the pay system reflects a number of considerations: it should attract and retain officers who are representative of the public served; it should be designed so as to ensure officers believe there is organisational justice within the system; it should be designed, based on evidence of need, and what works; it should facilitate deployability to a range of roles and requiring a range of skills; it should appropriately recognise the skills, knowledge, and attributes, and workload required". Responsibilities undertaken, the risk carried, and the size of the role should also be taken into account. Further, "We believe that to achieve such a system, existing anomalies need to be addressed. These include the need for a clear rationale for each element of the remuneration package.

PFEW believes that police officer pay and conditions should be determined nationally and that the particular responsibilities and restrictions of the Office of Constable should be taken into account when determining police pay.

We believe that officers should receive the same pay and conditions for like work and work of equal value. The Equality Act 2010 including the public sector equality duty applies to the Police Service. In this regard matters of employment and pay, both current and proposed, need to be assessed and monitored for their equality impact.

PFEW believes that the following core principles should be embedded in the pay and conditions of police officers:

- Pay and conditions of service for police officers should support the advancement of a police service that is representative of the public it serves. The pay system should attract and retain officers of differing genders, ethnicity and age groups.
- Pay conditions should be designed to ensure that officers believe that there is organisational justice such as fair pay and an appropriate distribution of pay.
- Pay and conditions should be designed based on evidence of need, especially where changes are considered, and based on what works in attracting, retaining and motivating officers of the right calibre and based on objective evaluation.

PFEW believes that in recent years members have endured a turbulent period of significant change to their pay and conditions following the Winsor review and the two-year incremental pay freeze imposed by the Government. In the short term it is not in the interests of the Police Service or the public it serves for this turbulence to continue.

PFEW believes that the Home Office and representatives of employers should monitor the impact of the recent changes to pay and conditions with a view to redressing any unintended consequences that may impact on the ability of the Service to recruit and retain officers.

PFEW believes that the Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB) should undertake a thorough examination of members pay and conditions in comparison to jobs of equal responsibility and value in other professions to address any pay gaps.

In the longer term, we believe the PRRB should consider:

- Pay and conditions aimed at attracting, recruiting and retaining suitably qualified officers and whose design takes into account an objective evaluation of job worth;
- An evidence based approach to workforce planning, with the role that pay and conditions play in that clearly demonstrated. For example there should be transparent and appropriate data regarding numbers of applicants as well as actual recruits; promotions; transfers between forces; gender, age, ethnic mix of officers; length of service of leavers by gender and ethnicity; numbers passing promotion criteria who are not subsequently promoted; the costs of replacing expertise when trained officers leave etc., as all of these affect the degree to which the pay system can be designed so as to support sufficient, capable and motivated officers with an appropriate demographic mix.
- Should significant changes be suggested to the pay and conditions system, appropriate modelling of the likely impacts should be undertaken in advance of changes.

PFEW believes that pay increases from 2016 onwards should enable officers and their families to maintain their standard of living, rather than falling behind as has been the case in the last few years.

### **Competence based pay**

Following the changes to pay progression arrangements for police officers arising out of the Winsor Review, PFEW believes that pay progression for police officers should be based on a national Personal Development Review (PDR) system that is fair, valid and reliable.

Line managers that carry out PDRs must be trained to ensure that the process is standardised and decision-making is consistent.

PFEW believes that any model of skills threshold assessment that officers would need to pass in order to progress up a pay scale must be based on a work-based assessment of normal continuous professional development activity and not a formal testing process as envisaged by Winsor.

PFEW believes that the top pay point of each pay scale should be open to all officers. The model of skills threshold assessments developed by the College of Policing should be viewed as a means of assessing officers' professionalism; they should not be viewed by Chief Officers as a means of limiting officers' access to pay. There should be no upper or lower limit on how many officers can access each pay point. Access to each pay point should be determined by objective criteria.

The College of Policing must develop a standard assessment process that is fair, valid and reliable given the significant implications for the pay of members. The College of Policing and Chief Officers must ensure that managers who are responsible for carrying out assessments are making those assessments consistently across England and Wales through the provision of national training and guidance on the assessment process.

The development of assessment standards must be based on an analysis of job requirements in all roles.

PFEW rejects any proposal to introduce any system of 'forced distribution' to determine access to police officer pay.

#### **4. Procedures/implementation**

PFEW will provide the Police Remuneration Review Body with submissions that are evidence-based. To do this, PFEW will carry out an annual survey of members on pay and conditions. PFEW will conduct research on pay and condition related issues to inform the evidence provided to the PRRB. This includes review of economic factors such as the various inflation indexes.

PFEW will hold the Home Office and employers' organisations to account to ensure that consideration of pay and conditions is on an evidence base approach, with appropriate data collected and provided to the Police Remuneration Review Body.

PFEW will engage with employers' representatives to discuss pay and condition related matters to facilitate an understanding of each other's priorities to allow for resolution of differences caused by the complexity of Police Regulations and determinations and to minimise the escalation of disputes.

PFEW will contribute to meetings of the Police Advisory Board of England and Wales, the College of Policing and Home Office to ensure that the views of members are represented.

PFEW will liaise with other police staff associations within England and Wales and across the UK.

Responsibility is delegated to the National Secretary supported by the Research and Policy department.

	Author	Date	Date to be reviewed	Change
Version 1	JD	March 2016	March 2018	
Version 2	KP	January 2019	March 2020	Minor changes

**Signed by:**



National Chair



National Secretary