

Making the Case

Views from police officers on the ground

© M. Chatterton (BA, Ph.D)

September 2011

Biography

Dr. Michael Chatterton has studied policing throughout his academic career, beginning with his doctoral research into the police officer's use of discretion in the late 1960s. He has since conducted many research projects on policing and crime prevention, funded by the Home Office, individual police forces, the ESRC and the Police Federation of England and Wales. He was one of a team from Manchester University which first identified the extent of repeat victimisation and demonstrated its application in reducing domestic burglary.

At the University of Manchester he designed and directed courses for police officers and crime prevention coordinators, including a Masters level course for senior police officers which was taught jointly with staff at the Bramshill Police College. More recently he has acted as a consultant to a multi- agency partnership team which addressed acquisitive crime using a market reduction strategy and has carried out research on 24/7 Response teams, detectives and workforce modernisation.

Acknowledgements

Without the cooperation of the police officers who attended the focus groups this study would not have been possible. I am indebted to them for attending, particularly to those who came in their own time, and for their frank and open contributions to the discussions.

Thanks are also owed to the members of the JBBs who set up the groups, sometimes at short notice, and to the chief officers in the study forces for allowing us to speak to their officers.

Finally, I would like to thank Ruth Meade and Mariam Moollan for their note-taking of the group sessions.

Michael Chatterton

September 2011

Contents

Introduction.....	6
1. The Existing Incremental Scale.....	7
2. Role Related Pay	8
• Role related basic pay.....	10
• Inter-dependence of roles.....	11
• Feasibility and flexibility	12
• Concerns over a pay structure linked to role	13
• Effect on career development opportunities.....	14
• Deployments to hard-to-fill roles	14
• Disaffection.....	15
3. Accredited Qualifications, Professional Development and Pay ...	17
• Qualifications for specialist posts.....	17
• Bonus payments for occasional exercise of specialist skills.....	18
• Qualifications and ability to do the job	20
4. Performance Related Pay.....	22
• Targets failed to reflect the wider policing mandate.....	22
• Negative consequences of quantitative performance management.....	23
• Results need to be placed in context	24
• PDRs, UPP and individual performance appraisal	25
• The Unsatisfactory Performance Procedures (UPP).....	26
• What the literature says.....	27
5. Regional Pay	31
• London allowances	32
6. The X Factor and Police Pay	35
• Off duty interventions	35
• The effect on officers' private lives	36
• The effect on members of the family.....	38
• Harassment.....	39
• The advantages of being a police officer.....	39
• Debt and Corruption.....	40

7. Overtime Payment	42
• The overtime imperative	42
• Officers' abuse of overtime	44
• Management's abuse of overtime	44
• The personal cost incurred by working overtime.....	46
8. Unsocial Hours Payment	49
• The cost borne by others.....	51
• Undesirable consequences.....	52
• Shift working – a case study	52
9. Short Term Commissions	54
10. Direct Entry	58
• Experience of policing in the lower ranks seen as indispensable	59
• Improving the quality of senior officers by internal measures	60
11. Conclusion	61
Appendix 1 – Exit Questionnaire	62

Introduction

This report was commissioned by the Joint Central Committee (JCC) of the Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW) in July 2011 following the publication of the 'Call for Evidence' for Part 2 of Tom Winsor's Independent Review of Police Officers' and Staff Remuneration and Conditions.

The JCC's aim was to ensure that the views and opinions of serving officers were sought, on a number of key areas addressed in the 'Call for Evidence', prior to the submission of the PFEW's response. These key areas included:

- How should basic pay in the police service be determined
- Is performance pay or role related pay a practical and/or desirable alternative
- Should there be a wider variety of entry routes to the police service

Focus groups were arranged by the PFEW's Joint Branch Boards in a number of police forces throughout England and Wales. Due to the social unrest which occurred in some areas of the UK during August 2011, 2 forces were compelled to withdraw from the study. However, a total of 9 focus groups were completed.

The focus groups each comprised between 7 and 22 police officers, encompassing ranks from Constable to Chief Inspector. The officers reflected a wide variety of frontline and support roles including Response, CID, Child Protection, Neighbourhood, Intelligence, Custody and Youth Involvement. They also represented the full range of service length, from under 2 years to over 29 years. Effort was made where possible to achieve a representative gender breakdown in each group.

Each focus group lasted approximately 3 hrs and was recorded for quality assurance purposes. The discussion covered the topics of incremental pay, role related pay, performance related pay, regional pay, the 'x factor' in police pay, overtime, unsocial hours payments, short term commissions and direct entry.

Notes of each session were taken by a member of the PFEW's Research Department, checked against the tapes of the discussions and used as the source for the edited quotations used in the text. To ensure that the discussion was as open as possible officers were guaranteed anonymity and any quotes included in the report are not attributed to individual officers.

At the end of each focus group the officers in attendance were asked to complete and return a questionnaire covering each of the topic areas discussed during the session. The questions were worded such that officers were required to rate the strength of their opinion. The results from these questionnaires have been used as supporting evidence in this report. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix 1.

1. The Existing Incremental Scale

The most important finding from the research is that, with very few exceptions, and some caveats regarding allowances, police officers are satisfied with the existing system for determining police pay and consider that, although it is not perfect, it is far better in every sense than any of the proposed alternatives.

89% of group members who completed the exit questionnaire stated they were satisfied with the incremental scale as a method of determining their level of pay. 51% stated they were very satisfied.

2. Role Related Pay

The issue of role-related pay was addressed by asking the groups whether or not they agreed that some police officers should be paid more than others within the same rank because of the job they do. Just under one third (31%) agreed with this proposal; a higher proportion than would have been expected given the level of satisfaction with the existing pay scale.

However, the discussions proved how important it is to contextualise responses given to questionnaire items by giving respondents the opportunity to expand upon the selections they make.

Many of those agreeing with this proposal had assumed the incremental scale would continue to exist in its present form and were arguing in favour of allowances on top of basic salary for particular posts. Recognising there would only be a finite sum of money available, they debated the strength of the claims of each post and disagreed over whether or not it qualified for a top up in salary.

When a role was singled out for the payment of an allowance other members of the group, supported by those who were opposed to role related payments on principle, would challenge the argument that it was special.

For every post that was put forward, members were able to find one or more features of that role which challenged the claim that it measured up for an allowance in every respect.

The only exception was the role of 24/7 Response officer which received universal support for an additional allowance. This included the small minority who had voted in favour of role related increases in basic salary.

Commenting on these disagreements, and noting in some cases how divisive the discussion was proving to be, other members of the groups stated this was indicative of the problems which arose when one attempted to select some roles for additional payment over others. The awarding of SPPs was repeatedly raised as a case in point and examples were cited where the award of a SPP was considered to have been inappropriate and therefore unfair to other post holders.

Although at this stage the discussions related to allowances and not to basic salary, the criteria used and more significantly perhaps, the differences in how they were interpreted and applied to posts, demonstrate how difficult it would be to devise a framework for differentiating between roles and assigning them different weights which most police officers would consider to be fair and just. (Winsor 2.37, 2.38).¹

¹ Independent Review of Police Officers' and Staff Remuneration and Conditions, Part 2 Call for Evidence, Winsor, June 2011

To capture the claims and counter-claims made in connection with role allowances, statements about the roles which were discussed in every group are presented as if they were spoken by a role incumbent making their own pitch for an allowance and challenging the entitlement of another role to one.

I am a firearms officer. My role is unique because it requires me to make life and death decisions and to live with the consequences if I have to shoot somebody. My major stress is living with the possibility that I could make an error of judgement and would have to cope with that trauma at a personal level and with the subsequent stressful enquiries into my actions. The amount and quality of training I receive are reassuring and this is a role I volunteered to do because it is where I want to be.

I am a 24/7 Response officer. I am the first to attend calls from members of the public when they are in danger or in need of assistance and I meet them at a wide variety of incidents. I have to make on-the-spot decisions in situations which initially can be very confusing, and create order out of chaos. As the protective equipment I carry testifies, I regularly have to confront angry and dangerous people. I work rotating shifts including full nights and recognise that has probably taken several years off my life expectancy. The resilience of the Response teams is very low so the work is hectic. I have been in Response for 5 years now and I am thinking of applying to move into a specialist role.

I work in a child protection unit. We are generally office based. Victim focussed roles like mine are seen by some colleagues as the 'soft and fluffy' side of policing in contrast with their 'roughly thoughty' roles. But they are emotionally draining and the cases I, and colleagues in similar units, have to deal with can be horrific and have a traumatic effect on you. Imagine having to trawl through image after image of child pornography. No-one could argue that the consequences of making a wrong decision are any less serious in my line of work.

I work in public protection unit which incorporates child protection. Our claim is equal to that of a firearms officer. They spend a lot of time training (which is not a bad thing) and on stand-by. The same applies to tactical aid groups. Thankfully firearms officers rarely have to shoot people and get shot at themselves. In the area of public protection we are understaffed so we are constantly on the go. We regularly deal with traumatic cases and horrific sex offences. Some of my colleagues are responsible for supervising dangerous sex offenders; paedophiles and the like. If we get it wrong there is sometimes a public outcry and certainly an internal enquiry.

I've done 5 years in firearms as a specialist officer on TAU etc. I don't think they should get paid more but I think they do more than has been said here. It's a very busy department. They do a lot of training because they are expected to do a lot of different things. I think they are paid for what they may have to do as opposed to what they do. However, I have faced more dangers out of that department than in being in it. Generally if you turn up as a firearms officer people do what you tell them to because they know you are armed

whereas on Response, without a gun you are stopping cars with 4 or 5 people in them on your own or even if there are 2 of you... I am certain you have more chance of being assaulted on the job without being armed.

As a traffic officer I never know whether the next vehicle I stop will contain someone carrying a gun. From intelligence we know that members of organised crime groups regularly pass through our area. I deal with fatal road collisions some of which are particularly horrific as part of my role and as a family support officer I witness the grief of those who have lost loved ones in road collisions.

It seems to me that people in the group are attaching a lot of importance to risk but it is difficult to see how you can objectively quantify the level of risk associated with a post. Any officer who deals with the public is at risk but it varies with time and place. I was in surveillance. I spent a lot of time on 'no risk', just on observations sitting in a car but then I also spent time deployed in some of the riskiest areas in the country where I would be walking down back alleys on my own following people and it could have gone very wrong. I was also employed on some terrorist jobs where it could have gone very wrong. But that was some of the time.

I am a CID officer. I don't face the degree of physical risk that colleagues on Response do but my job is not entirely without risk, for example when I go out and arrest people. But they are not the only type of risks – there're others where my job scores high. The detective in the Shipman case could have lost his job if the correct procedure had not been followed. You put yourself on the line in a different sense than people in the tactical aid unit.

After the claims of these and other posts had been debated at some length the groups were asked to identify those posts which could justifiably be asked to take a drop in basic salary to fund the allowances they had been discussing. In no group was a post identified.

- **Role related basic pay**

At this point the discussion moved from the award of allowances to basic salary and the question of whether all police officer posts should be on the same salary scale. Whereas members had been disagreeing about various job characteristics and the criteria used to rank them, when it came to a discussion of basic salary levels, with the exception of a small minority, participants identified the contribution each role made to the organisation and no one challenged the value of that contribution and suggested it was any less valuable than others. Those who had argued in favour of giving an allowance to a certain role did not extend the argument and claim the basic salary of that role should be higher.

The minority view supported the case for any public - facing role which exposed its incumbent to the risk of being assaulted, receiving a higher basic salary.

I work in a tactical aid group. I should receive a higher salary now and if later I move to a back office job I'll accept lower pay because I won't have to go home and explain my black eye to my kids or worry that I might injure my back kicking a door in and be pensioned off.

Their colleagues disagreed. They spoke about the intrinsic value of each role to the organisation and stressed that roles are so inter-dependent that the contribution of one cannot be considered separately from that of others.

▪ **Inter-dependence of roles**

Because a police force is an entity of various parts it relies on the willingness of those inter-dependent parts to work together to deliver a service to the public. Members stressed the importance of maintaining a culture in policing which encourages cooperation. Role related pay threatens this because it is divisive.

Members regularly compared a police force to a machine and claimed that policing roles were similar to its constituent cogs, each part making its contribution and dependent on others for theirs. Another officer used a similar, perhaps less appropriate, analogy!

Every officer deserves to be placed on the same scale regardless of the role they do. Every post makes its contribution. The police service needs 'hares and tortoises' and there are roles to suit all types.

In my role I work with other agencies dealing with vulnerable people who have been persistent callers to the police in the past. By helping to sort out their problems I reduce the pressure on the Response teams who would be calling back the whole time.

As a supervisor working in a crime prevention unit we have an important role in preventing crime. The work of teams such as mine in preventing repeat victimisation for example, is well documented. With our partners we have made a significant contribution by reducing crime levels, saving officers from having to make multiple visits to the same address.

As a Response officer I appreciate the valuable assistance I receive from colleagues in the real time Intelligence Unit. They help my colleagues and I to risk-assess situations on the ground which helps to protect us. They also generate intelligence which we use all the time in the course of our work.

In Territorial Support we rely very much on the intelligence provided by other officers in specialist departments about premises we are going to raid etc.

I am on restricted duties and work in a unit dealing with those calls from the public which do not require an immediate response. After discussing the matter with the caller it is invariably resolved to their satisfaction without an

officer having to attend. This takes pressure off the Response teams. Although we are not out there we are part of the front line.

The government think of the so called 'front line' as a uniform and a shield but the 'back office' personnel (I hate the term because it is so misleading) complete the work of colleagues in Response, Territorial Support Units etc. You can make thousands of arrests in riot situations but other units like mine take the case, do the follow up enquiries, prepare the file and make sure the work of those officers eventually results in a successful prosecution.

Who is the more important to the public? The uniformed officer who catches the criminal on the street or the detective who makes sure the evidence is found to produce a successful prosecution? You can't differentiate on which is the more important role.

I am a specialist trainer and because of the work I do I don't do shift work so someone on Response should get some extra money for that. But if you argue their job is more valuable than mine then I disagree. If an officer gets a bit more for doing PSU or firearms then that's ok but we should all be paid the same basic salary because our roles are just as valuable.

We are all officers with the same goals – prevention of crime etc. It doesn't matter what you do we all contribute to that and we are all as valuable as each other. Each role is like a piece in the jigsaw. Each one is needed to complete the picture. We all depend on each other.

I am a dog handler trainer. Is training not important? Would you call that a 'back office' role and therefore one which should be on a lower salary scale? Isn't the expertise I have built up through years of experience and put into training important? In addition I am called out to firearms incidents and sometimes my dog and I enter the property first.

▪ **Feasibility and flexibility**

Many relevant examples were given of how flexible police officers are obliged to be to enable forces to respond to the unpredictable and unforeseen. A perfect illustration was provided in one force which was visited the morning after the first night of rioting in London and Birmingham. A member of the focus group told us that, had he not been attending the focus group and had arrived at work at his usual time, by that stage he would have been on his way down to London deployed on one of the mutual aid PSUs.

From my job description you would classify me as a back office person. The labels are misleading.

Other officers provided examples of how the 'label' did not describe adequately what went into the 'tin' and warned how it would lead to inequities and a good deal of resentment if job labels were used as the base-line for a job evaluation.

I work in a Volume Crime Unit and because I'm not responsible for servicing a job queue I am one of the first to be called out if there's an incident.

Police officers are obliged to be available to respond to different scenarios irrespective of the role they do. A role could be evaluated as back office but the officer could be called out on mutual aid or to backfill on Response.

I am a section sergeant and this is one of my officers. At the moment she is working on Response because the schools are on holiday and she is a school liaison officer. You can see the problem with evaluating her role. She's part Response and part something else. It's complicated because in her school role she has dealt with knifing incidents, child protection issues and provided useful intelligence

This week Nottinghamshire's police staff were on strike – their jobs were done by police officers who were pulled off their normal duties to stand in. We are multi functional and flexible. If you had a tight contract you could refuse to do it – not my remit.

▪ **Concerns over a pay structure linked to role**

Members were asked to consider the consequences for themselves, the police service and the public if role related pay was introduced.

Financial uncertainty was a predominant concern. The great benefit of the current incremental scale was stated to be the income predictability which enables officers to plan and manage their financial affairs e.g. mortgages. This concern underpinned many of their specific objections.

Having calculated the drop in her disposal income over the next two years an officer stated that she had put her residence up for rent and was moving in with her parents.

How demeaning is that. Going back to live with your parents at the age of 38.

Others agreed that if officers were moved to a lesser paid post such economy measures would become more common. Similar comments were made in other groups.

You base your mortgage on your income but the force could move you into a role where your wage could fall.

A reduction in salary could result in officers going into debt; particularly but not exclusively, younger members who are paying back student loans. We shall return to the issue of debt in a later section of the report.

Many groups mentioned the issue of resilience and the risk that higher paid posts would be the first to be reduced if economies were called for.

If you have four response officers and give them enhancement and then the force has to cut its spend they will move one of those officers to save money and the unit will be understaffed.

- **Effect on career development opportunities**

One of the attractions of a career in the police service is that it provides officers with an opportunity to spend time in different departments and perform a variety of roles to develop their careers. The present pay structure supports this by enabling lateral movement across roles without incurring a drop in basic pay. It was argued that if roles were on different pay grades some personal development moves would be unattractive because they would carry an un-affordably high financial penalty. Members argued that the curtailment of lateral movement would be bad for the service as well as the officers.

Part of the appeal of this job is the variety of roles you get to work in. That would change if pay rates were different for each role. Officers could not afford to go for the lower paid roles even if they were relevant for their development.

I have less than 2 years in the job. I can make decisions about my career and where I want to go. I know what my salary cheque will be in x years time. I know what the role I choose will be paid. I would have an issue with it if the 'goal posts' changed like we have been discussing.

Development opportunities would also suffer as a result of the increased competition for the higher paid roles This would reduce the chances of officers who had a genuine interest in that line of work and lead to the appointment of some whose primary motivation was financial and who may not be the best suited to that line of work.

Officers are currently 'vocationally motivated' but they would inevitably be financially motivated under the proposed pay system. This would result in some of the wrong people doing the jobs with higher pay.

At the moment members of the public are generally dealt with by some-one who wants to be in that job and isn't chasing pay. The quality of service would suffer if people were in jobs for the wrong reason.

- **Deployments to hard-to-fill roles**

Members recognised that if lower paid posts became hard to fill because there were insufficient suitable volunteers willing to fill them then management would exercise its right to move officers into them. This was one of the consequences of being in a disciplined service.

When it comes down to it, it's the force and not us that ultimately decides which roles we're posted to.

We had officers posted to an investigation team. They were told their roles were no longer front line. In that case they lost their SPP for six months and they considered that to be unjust. I can imagine what their reaction would have been if the posting had meant a drop in basic pay.

If there are hard- to- fill posts then officers will be posted to them. We are a disciplined service. It would amount to management ordering you to accept a reduction in your take home pay.

Some groups were additionally concerned about nepotism and the use of deployments to lower paid posts as 'punishment moves'.

The options available to some officers are limited now because they are on restricted duties. While they are recovering they are forced into other roles which would probably attract a lower salary if role related pay was introduced. Those officers who had sustained the injury when on duty would feel doubly aggrieved. Until they were able to return to their role they would have to accept a reduction in pay – penalised rather than recompensed for putting themselves at risk.

Officers on restricted duties are placed in roles which some would describe as back office. If this meant a drop in basic pensionable pay they would not only feel disgruntled but betrayed if the injury that had placed them there had been sustained on duty.

I was on restricted last year. I still felt my contribution was worthwhile even though I was now doing a different job. Making these posts available is a good way of getting people back to full duties – rehabilitation, but if I'd had to take a drop in salary that would have been hard to bear. I think some people would stick in their existing post and carry the injury which is not good for them, the organisation or their colleagues.

▪ **Disaffection**

The anger that people felt over role related pay and other proposals surfaced during many of the discussions. Members used terms such as 'the last straw', 'a step too far' and 'betrayal'. The general view was that if the government went ahead with these changes forces would lose the goodwill on which they depended constantly.

I don't think enough emphasis is put on just how militant the rank and file are feeling. Notwithstanding not having the right to strike the feeling on the ground is 'if this and that is going to be taken off me or if I'm going to be marginalised in a role that I didn't particularly join the job to do or if you put me on a lower base point then you watch the efficiency drive go right out of the window' There will be a lot of industrial sabotage. Unseen industrial action.

Few group members articulated their opposition to the proposals in such strong terms. Some believed that professionalism would prevail and officers would still endeavour to provide the best service to the public they could.

Many others believed that the introduction of role related pay, on top of other changes would deal a deadly blow to police morale. We were reminded that the interdependence of the 'cogs in the machine' meant it only needed one of them to turn more slowly for the productivity of the rest to suffer. The proposed changes were inviting such a response because, as one officer stated, echoing the views of many of his colleagues :

If the government want to give more money to some posts to motivate them what effect do they believe taking money away from others will have?

3. Accredited Qualifications, Professional Development and Pay

Groups were asked 'To what extent would you agree that a police officer's level of pay should take into account the accredited qualifications they have acquired and the amount of professional development they have undertaken?'

Members recognised that the answers to this question would be similar to those they had already given as it raised similar issues to those we had discussed in relation to role related pay.

Attaining and retaining a specialist post was viewed in all groups as sufficient compensation in itself for the time and effort invested in acquiring accredited qualifications. Their contribution when they were in post, exercising those skills and using their specialist knowledge, was considered to be sufficiently rewarded by the existing incremental pay scale. Specialist post holders in the groups were generally in agreement with their colleagues on this issue, and emphasised the intrinsic satisfaction they gained from performing their role.

The question of whether officers with specialist qualifications should receive a bonus payment or allowance when their expertise is needed and they are pulled out of their usual role, proved to be a different issue. Members disagreed over which bonuses, if any, should be paid to which post holders. One view was that the overtime earned on these occasions should be sufficient reward but if the rules governing the payment of overtime were to be changed at some future point then, it was agreed, the issue of bonuses would have to be re-visited.

Members failed to agree over the related question of whether qualifications acquired prior to entering the police service should be recognised through an extra payment.

Paying fixed amounts of money for each course or qualification was rejected outright. All the groups were strongly opposed to the idea of each course and qualification carrying its own type of 'loyalty card' bonus points: an analogy reflecting the general cynicism expressed in many of the groups about the growth of accreditation. Many members thought it devalued experience and expertise gained on the job.

• Qualifications for specialist posts

No criticisms were levelled at any of the wide range of courses and qualifications taken by officers in specialist posts. Having a good proportion of officers from specialist posts in the groups we were provided with many examples of these courses and no payment on top of basic salary was asked for.

A dog handler gave a long list of courses he had taken and the skills they had given him but added –

I chose to go into that job. You do the courses to progress your career and because you are interested to learn more. It's a chance to make yourself a better officer. You shouldn't expect to be paid extra because of that.

Other officers argued that:

Courses should be seen as the building blocks to make better police officers and shouldn't earn people more than their basic salary. I have City and Guilds. I use what I have learnt to deal with foreign lorry drivers, do family liaison so on. As long as I'm using skills to build my career I don't expect to be paid any extra money

To become a trainer I had to get a Cert Ed. I was given a bit of time to do it. I am happy doing the job I wanted and it got me there.

Some participants referred to the fact that many of these courses were taken in duty time and certain of the skills learnt had a wider currency within the labour market.

There should be no additional recompense because a) you do the courses in work time very often and b) you are equipped for a career when you leave the service. As a collision investigator I could be of use to an insurance company or use my teaching qualification to teach in school.

Our serious economic crime unit needs people with accountancy qualifications. They send people away to train them in the force's time. It's reasonable for the force to expect a return of service for that – not to pay on top of salary. Especially as they can use the qualification when they retire.

Not everyone agreed.

I would say a lot of qualifications aren't transferable – some of mine would not be accepted in other forces.

▪ **Bonus payments for occasional exercise of specialist skills**

Basic police officer pay should be standard across the board but I have a colleague who is called upon to act as an interpreter. He should receive an extra payment when he performs that role because it is over and above his regular duties.

Other roles discussed included hostage negotiator, search specialist, interview advisor, bronze commander.

Those in favour of a bonus payment argued it was justified because when officers are taken away from their 'day job' their work builds up, and when an officer is 'on call' it restricts their social life.

Objections to the proposal were made on feasibility grounds. A search for a dead body, or of premises where a body had been lying for some time, is qualitatively different from searching a road prior to the visit of the queen a bonus payment would be justified for the one but not the other.

To be fair the payment would need to be specific to the particular job. It would be a bureaucratic nightmare.

The chief objection to additional payments for accredited qualifications was that courses are not available to everyone who wants one and there is a limit to the number of officers needed to perform specialist tasks. In some groups negative comments were added about the recruitment and selection process and some accusations of nepotism were made. The payment of bonuses would be divisive and compound existing resentment.

I was a TSG sergeant. The chief inspector refused to put many people forward but I got in because he wasn't in when my application went through. It was luck on my part I was able to get that role. It would not be fair if I earned more than others who weren't so lucky.

I've been lucky. I've been away and done courses and got qualifications. I've got a qualification as a vehicle examiner. Two other guys put in for it but the inspector on my shift supported me and I got it. It was pure luck. The other two didn't. Why should I get paid more because I was lucky?

There are lots of courses I would like to do but I've been turned down. Standard and advanced driving courses are particularly difficult to get onto. Why should the lucky ones get a bonus as well?

The waiting list for level 2 public order training is lengthy. I was told I could be waiting over a year.

I applied for training as a family liaison officer but my manager said they didn't think there was a need so did not put me forward.

You can fall out with a supervisor and that's your chances of getting a place gone.

A different access problem was raised with respect to national and regional accreditation; presumably by those in favour of payments for accreditation. It has not been possible to check on this point but those who raised it complained it would be unfair if only nationally accredited courses were rewarded and officers who had acquired the same skills through other routes were disadvantaged in consequence.

Some of those who argued in favour of bonus payments acknowledged there were problems of access but insisted that management had to assess staffing requirements and bonus payments would help resolve the problem of persuading those who were trained to put themselves forward.

I used to manage SOIT. We got people trained but they won't use those skills. They say they are not available so we can't use the skills. It's always the same people you have to rely on. People should be paid both for having the skill and when they use it, to encourage them to come forward. Perhaps 50/50.

Conversely an argument used against such payments was that the skills they acquired by obtaining an accredited qualification gave those officers access to overtime payments. It was unnecessary to award bonus payments on top.

Some courses already put you in a position where you'll get more money as they make you eligible for overtime e.g. searches. You could call them 'overtime courses'!

- **Qualifications and ability to do the job**

The groups could envisage a situation where newer members of a team had been able to obtain qualifications during their training whereas longer-serving and much more experienced colleagues, whom they relied upon daily for guidance and advice, were not formally qualified and would, therefore, not qualify for an additional payment. Younger members of the groups who were in this situation, stated they would find it extremely awkward and feared it would introduce a tension between members of a squad who need to work together.

I am in CID and have just gained a foundation degree qualification in relation to that line of work but I am nowhere near as accomplished as colleagues with more experience who are not formally qualified. There is no way I want an additional payment for my qualification.

Let's take the case of someone who's been in CID for 15 years or more and done all the old training courses but has no qualification. Then some-one comes in with a qualification. Do you think they should earn more? I don't. Never.

The incremental scale still works. People tend to get paid more as they go through the service and that's as it should be. As you go through the service you pick up skills and get roles.

In the eyes of some group members bonus payments for qualifications represent a further demeaning of job experience. They resented the dominant emphasis on accreditation and qualifications.

The principal objection to additional payments for qualifications and the exercise of specialist skills and knowledge was the fact that it would prove to be divisive. People stated they were genuinely concerned about the effect this, and similar moves, would have on camaraderie which was so important in an organisation where officers depend so heavily on the support and goodwill of their colleagues.

4. Performance Related Pay .

Initially, half of group members were unsure how to vote on the question of whether a police officer's pay should be related to their performance. Forty-four percent were opposed to the suggestion from the outset and a mere 6% agreed. The waivers supported the idea in principle but had serious reservations about whether it could be achieved in practice. Members' experience of performance assessment in the police service led them to question whether forces had the wherewithal to capture and measure performance accurately. They feared that the introduction of performance related pay would result in the return of target setting and a renewed emphasis on Personal Performance Indicators. They had witnessed in the past how these crude attempts at performance assessment had led to the devaluing of aspects of policing that are more difficult to measure, the encouragement of unethical practices to achieve quick results and a poorer service to the community.

There's no denying the fact that performance related pay would guarantee the return of the target culture.

They were also highly critical of the way personal appraisals are conducted at the present time and everyone agreed the Personal Development Review (PDR) system was not fit for purpose. First line supervisors were recognised as having a vital role to play in this system and the Unsatisfactory Performance Procedure (UPP) but they were criticised for neglecting to perform it. Supervisors claimed they did not have the training and resources to obtain first-hand knowledge of how their officers perform on the ground and that senior management did not encourage and support them in the use of the UPP.

After discussing these issues at some length, only 7% of respondents completing the exit questionnaire remained unsure about linking pay with performance. By that stage the majority (63%) had decided the police service did not have the capability at the present time to assess performance reliably and they were therefore, opposed to the introduction of performance related pay.

On similar grounds 65% disagreed with the introduction of the 'at risk' element in pay.

- **Targets failed to reflect the wider policing mandate.**

The groups typically stated that the idea of rewarding performance had much to commend it but that one of the chief difficulties lay in finding appropriate measures which would cover all aspects of police work. The consensus was that the targets used to date have not been sufficiently comprehensive.

Police officers perform a wide variety of tasks. How do you measure tasks that are aimed at prevention and are service oriented?

How do you evaluate what goes on under the heading of community safety, youth engagement and so on? Some roles cannot be measured.

What's the worth of an arrest against acquiring a good piece of intelligence?

- **Negative consequences of quantitative performance management**

Because officers appreciated some jobs were more likely to produce 'ticks in the boxes' than others they would 'cherry pick' the jobs they worked on and it was argued this would lead to undesirable competition between officers.

I was first officer on the scene. Someone had broken into a house and given a person a pasting – broke their cheekbone. I gave first aid, called an ambulance etc and passed it on to a colleague to arrest the perpetrator. I went to the hospital, seized the clothing. Following up on the incident took quite a while but I'm not shown as the person who made the arrest. What I did isn't shown. My colleague gets credited with the arrest. I have no complaint because they're my colleague but it looks like I've been unproductive.

It was feared that competition could also lead to abstractions from the team at busiest times.

You can set your stall out to arrest drunk drivers but the rest of the Response team will be affected by your absence from the street.

Seemingly 'good' performance can result from questionable practices some of which put the officers in jeopardy and damage relationships with members of the public. In contrast instance where police officers use their discretion are more difficult to capture and measure.

Payment by results would undermine the emphasis forces are placing at present on the use of discretion. You stop good police work by having targets. A good bobby is one that uses other forms of disposal to taking someone into custody. That's encouraged now. When targets were in you were pulling Mr and Mrs Nice and giving them a ticket just to meet your target.

I'll give you an example of how PPIs can ruin the job. A traffic unit is going to a Road Traffic Collision (RTC) Grade 1 (the highest grade) and they stop their vehicle on route to give a ticket. Five points for a ticket, nothing for attendance at a RTC.

You are supposed to deal with victims of rape as recommended by the NPIA but when you are measured by the percentage detected you go for a detection or 'no crime' it. Victims who may not want to go to court are forced

to.

Playground spats - you have juveniles locked up when a word with the teacher would suffice.

Officers will resort to the old trick of keeping some of the detected crimes back for the following month if they have achieved their target that month.

Now everyone knows about the problem of using detection rates and the abuses they cause, surely they couldn't be used to set pay.

Use of section 5 Public Order is a classic. You could get at least one every Saturday night.

One of my inspectors had an obsession with 'bean counting' So every time we saw someone p...ing in a doorway we had to nick them, then de-arrest them, then they would get a warning letter and I'd crime it. I had 42 of them during that time. It was terrible.

Two final quotes sum up the groups' views on the consequences of a return of stretched targets and basing pay on results.

As soon as you set a target you can bet your 'bottom dollar' that the cops will do whatever is necessary to achieve it.

Can you imagine the public's response once it got out that we were paid for arrests or fixed penalty tickets or court summonses ... 'you've only done that because you get paid extra for it'.

• **Results need to be placed in context**

Attention was drawn to the considerable amount of 'drilling down' for detailed information which is required if an officer's achievements, and the quality of their performance is to be assessed accurately. Officers would be entitled to appeal if crude measures of assessment were used that failed to take account of relevant contextual factors.

It's not like producing widgets. You can spend a lot of time and effort investigating something, but through no fault of your own you don't crack the job; there's no result to show for it.

Each job is an individual set of circumstances that you have no control over. A statistic shows one burglary but it can take a few minutes or it could take hours.

Take a recent case where an officer was investigating a burglary and found the person he was investigated had committed 580 cases of fraud. One of his colleagues was investigating a serious assault which took days because of where it happened, the number of witnesses involved etc. Whose

performance was higher?

One month I can do a huge amount of work for a few detections but then the next month I lock up a burglar who wants to clean their slate and confess to a shed-load of offences. Should you use detections to measure my performance? Which was my best month?

I'm an officer investigating armed offenders who operated across 2 counties. It's taken countless man-hours. It's a conspiracy offence. I will only get 5 detections.

If the CPS refuses a file it's not a detection even though you have done all the work. It's unfair to measure detections.

A detective in a specialist department pointed to the problem in using products such as arrests to assess an individual's performance when they were the result of team work.

The most recent arrest we had there were 50 people at the briefing. How do you decide who has done more than any else?

Certain areas provide greater opportunities to achieve targets than others as - illustrated by the case of a specialist squad which had been criticised for failing to attain its targets. No account had been taken of the nature of the operation and area they had been working in.

I had an issue in my previous role. We were very performance oriented. We had targets to meet each month. We could be sent on operations to the four quarters of the force but were still expected to meet the same targets. No account was taken of where we were sent. For example, if we were sent to the city centre or a certain BCU we would have no problem hitting those targets. But then we would be sent to another area on a separate operation and we were still expected to meet the same targets. That's when you get the situation the present Chief is trying to avoid, where things are made up...it breeds malpractice and people start to do things they shouldn't.

It's been suggested letters of commendation should be used as a PPI. For many members of the community where I work it would take a real effort to write a letter.

• **PDRs, UPP and individual performance appraisal**

The police service operates a Personal Development Review (PDR) system in which officers have no confidence. It is seen as a time-wasting, bureaucratic irrelevance. Quality information on how and why individual officers have performed is not generally collected and used by supervisors to review performance at the present time. In theory an officer's immediate supervisors are well placed to collect and record this information but most of the time, we were told, all they will know is that a particular officer has attended an

incident. Even if they are aware of the outcome it is highly unlikely they will know *how* the officer had dealt with it.

Quantitative measures don't work so you look at the qualitative but PDRs are ineffective and ultimately flawed. You write your own PDR and the line manager approves it. Some line managers do it very well, most just play lip service. What if your pay's affected because your line manager doesn't do their job or because there's a clash of personalities?

Take as an example an incident where an officer has to liaise with a family where there has been a sudden death. They could do the job well and make the family feel better or do it badly and have a major negative impact. Both would just show as a visit

Supervisors need to be good at the job they do. My experience is that in general supervision isn't good enough. They won't challenge.

What gets produced by the PDR system is not worth the paper it's written on

A probationer compared his experience in the police with his previous role in another organisation where you had to provide evidence that you had gone 'above and beyond' to qualify for a bonus. The system did not rely on figures and the line managers' knowledge of how you operated enabled them to challenge what they were told.

It was very different from what I'm experiencing now. The management structure is totally different. I have kept a folder with all my evidence. No one in two years has asked me to prove what I've done is 'above and beyond'.

The first line managers in this group thought the probationer's experience was extreme but accepted that obtaining the type of evidence he referred to would require an investment of time and effort which the typical line manager could not afford.

• **The Unsatisfactory Performance Procedures (UPP)**

A large majority of group members was opposed to the introduction of the 'at risk' element in pay although every group member could call to mind an officer they considered to be a 'slacker'. There would appear to be a very small minority of officers who are not 'pulling their weight' according to their colleagues. Officers are critical of the organisation for not using the UPP to deal with them. Apparently it has become the norm not to challenge if someone is borderline, to 'go with the flow' and possibly move them on to a different post.

It's down to bad supervision. They don't implement UPP properly and it fails.

The supervision of police officers is very poor. Sergeants and above. It's the whole structure of the organisation.

Supervisors provided an important insight into the problem, citing examples of how they had not been supported by higher management when they had instigated proceedings.

If you raise an issue of performance it is sent back down for you deal with. You are not supported as a supervisor. You just create difficulties for yourself and it's easier not to raise the problem.

It's an organisational issue. As a supervisor you are not supported. The UPP is complicated and time consuming. It takes for ever as there are so many stages and you need so much evidence.

Supervisors move around a lot so there is often no continuity of knowledge of poor performance. When you come into an area as a supervisor it's very difficult to invoke the UPP if several previous supervisors have not reported any problems with the individual concerned.

I was using Regulation 13 (Discharge of Probationer) regarding an individual who was not performing and was physically unfit. I was moved and left it with another inspector who decided not to pursue it. It was no coincidence, I think, that it was a temporary inspector.

The lack of moral courage is further up the line. I have dealt with poor performance and given detailed reports to senior managers and they were not deemed to be suitable. It kept being sent back to me. Eventually a decision was made for nothing to happen.

As a supervisor you are wide open to counter allegations of bullying and harassment. You are seen as problematic. I have been investigated more thoroughly than the person I said was underperforming.

Sergeants cited the wide range of other responsibilities they carried which left little time to go out on patrol and observe how their constables performed at incidents. When they had been 'acting up' as temporarily promoted sergeants it would have been impossible on several counts to invoke UPP.

• **What the literature says**

The above statements concerning quantitative performance management, personal performance assessment and the role supervisors play in the PDR and UPP should be considered alongside the findings of published work on these issues which provide both confirmation of what was said in the group discussions. and an explanation of what they described.

FitzGerald et.al. conducted focus groups and interviews with police officers and observed them at work to seek an explanation of the gap between what Londoners expected from their police and what they received. The unintended

consequences of performance management systems were found to be important determinants.

The complexities of police work have become forgotten as public sector managerialism has increasingly dominated police administration. The process hasgiven primacy to narrow crime fighting objectives (and) has had several perverse effects. (Fitzgerald 137)²

However, the need to secure greater accountability had led politicians, civil servants and senior managers willingly to suspend their disbelief in the value of the performance indicators (PIs) applied to measure the operation of complex institutions. PIs have been oversimplified; unreliable outcome measures have been the rule rather than the exception; and the creation or collation of PI statistics has often fallen within the control of those whose performance is being measured. Targets have been set both nationally and locally in very arbitrary fashion, with little or no idea whether they are within the capacity of those who have to achieve them. (op cit 138)

Another study by Civitas concluded:

“Centralisation has led to politicisation and the introduction of targets. Bonuses are paid to senior officers based on compliance with targets. In order to achieve the required level of detections, police officers pursue those who will yield easy convictions, such as speeding motorists or high-spirited students, rather than the serious and persistent offenders who are destroying the quality of life in communities”. (Sergeant 2008 viii).³

In a study of detectives Chatterton found that sanction detection targets had led to the direction of police resources at the investigation of crimes which were easy to detect and offered the potential for more than one detection, the manipulation of detection rates for key crimes through the informal reclassification of crimes, and the temptation to engage in more ethically dubious practices as targets were further stretched. (Chatterton 2008. 84)⁴

An earlier study of 24/7 Response officers had found that they were working under similar pressures to meet targets, with challenges to their integrity. (Chatterton 2006).⁵

A comprehensive study of sergeants by HMIC in 2008⁶ provides an explanation of why sergeants would have difficulty providing the kind of information on personal performance that would be required if performance related pay were introduced.

² *Policing for London*. Fitzgerald, M., Hough, M., Joseph, I. and Qureshi, T. (2002) Willan Publishing

³ *The Public and the Police*. Harriet Sergeant. (2008) Civitas

⁴ Michael Chatterton, January 2008, *Losing the Detectives, Views from the Frontline*, PFEW

⁵ Michael Chatterton and Emma Bingham, October 2006, *Response Policing in the Modern Police Organisation, Views from the Frontline*, PFEW

⁶ *Leading from the Frontline*, HMIC, May 2008, Thematic Inspection

...45% of front line sergeant's time is spent on non-operational duties. Only 10% of time was spent supervising/ managing incidents at the scene. (op.cit. 6.7)

Of the (sergeant) respondents to the questionnaire, 37% said they were provided with specific training for their role as supervisor of front line uniformed response staff by their force at the point of posting or in preparation for posting. (HMIC 2008. 3.54)

Acting sergeants were least likely to have received training for the rank of sergeant. Of the acting sergeants who responded to the questionnaire, only 25% had received any training relevant to the role. (op.cit 3.59).

These unqualified sergeants are ill-equipped to collect and use performance assessment data yet they comprise a significant proportion of first line supervisors.

The actual proportion of acting sergeants....(was) 16% of all frontline sergeants encountered. In one BCU in a Metropolitan force, 6 of the 19 front line sergeants interviewed (32%), were acting sergeants.(op.cit 3.60)

Similar findings were found in an earlier study commissioned by the PFEW Sergeants' Central Committee on the use of acting sergeants nationally. The 'abuse' of acting sergeants took several forms:

- 1. Using constables for acting up duties before they have passed any promotion examinations.*
- 2. Providing no relevant training to constables specifically to prepare them for acting up duties.*
- 3. Requiring constables to act for periods of time that are too short for them to develop the necessary skills and knowledge or for longer than it may be necessary for development purposes.*
- 4. Providing no feedback on performance in the acting up role and taking no account of it when assessing suitability for promotion.⁷ (Chatterton: 2003)*

The HMIC drew conclusions about the PDR system which are identical to those of the focus groups.

Little evidence was found of the PDR being used as a framework for assessing individual performance and addressing aspiration, for either lateral or vertical development. (op.cit 4.1)

....(from) the sample of PDRs ...it was clear that the vast majority .. were 'candidate-driven' i.e. the evidence was supplied by the appraisee, with little apparent checking or validation by the appraiser. (op.cit.4.13)

⁷ The Abuse of Acting Sergeants.- a report to the Sergeants Central Committee of PFEW. (Unpublished) Chatterton, 2003

It appears to HMIC from the evidence that the PDR process within the police service is in disrepute. (op cit 4.21).

5. Regional Pay

The groups were asked to consider the extent to which they would agree that police officers living in certain areas should receive higher levels of pay than those living elsewhere?

Sixty seven percent of those who completed the exit questionnaire were opposed to the proposal, 26% agreed with it.

The discussion focused on two related aspects of this question: a payment based on where an officer lives and one based on the area where they work.

The majority of group members did not favour regional allowances based on where you work.

The general view in the groups was that the basic salary structure available to officers should be the same, irrespective of the area where they policed.

Officers deployed on mutual aid would resent being paid less than colleagues they were working alongside.

The demands of policing in more affluent rural locations were compared with those faced by police officers working in deprived urban areas. The differences were noted but the prevailing view was that, when the challenges and compensations attached to working in each type of area were seriously considered, there was nothing to justify awarding different levels of pay.

Officers in rural areas can also be called on to attend riots, or you may need to deal with a shotgun incident e.g. Cumbria. There was the officer, PC Bill Barker, who died on the bridge in Workington during the floods.

In more rural areas backup can be a long way away so they can potentially be more difficult and dangerous areas to work.

I've worked in rural areas and in the city and it's different but both make their demands.

It is not easy to differentiate between rural/metropolitan areas as in cities you are likely to have more backup. In rural areas an officer has to look after him/herself but it's quieter.

An interesting observation was that if criteria were to be devised in future, tightly linking type of work with location for pay purpose, it would produce an 'administrative nightmare' as the principle could be extended, and the same criteria used to differentiate between areas within a police force or even within a BCU. Others argued that even trying to adopt it for regions would be too complicated because of the differences existing within the same region.

It would just be too complicated to implement

- **London allowances**

It appeared from the discussions that most group members assumed that the allowances provided to Metropolitan officers were established and, therefore, fell outside the scope of the discussion. Even in groups where the questionnaire results indicated there had been no-one in favour of the introduction of allowances based on where one lived, the principal of London Allowances was accepted.

Generally, officers nationally accept that Met officers get higher pay and free travel. It is reasonable that they should do so. However, it would be less likely to be accepted if an attempt was made to extend a system of different allowances nationally.

Basic pay shouldn't vary, although allowances for London are potentially acceptable.

The job shouldn't pay someone more because they choose to live in a particular place. For the Met. I don't know. Maybe. It's up to an officer where they want to live and for the job to decide where you work

The additional allowances paid to Met officers are a special case due to the high cost of living

London is unique.

When reservations were expressed about Met allowances they related to members of that force who did not live in London but claimed the allowances.

A lot of Met officers live in Andover. They commute 1.5 hours and get a London allowance so get more money. They accept the commute because of that. If you know how much you get paid depending on where you work, you can make the choice about the commute.

I could give you examples of MPS officers who are getting paid extra through the allowances but they commute from their places in Spain and France and travel some distance in the country e.g Northampton etc. This can be divisive.

The majority of group members did not favour regional allowances based on where you live.

Regional pay was criticised as a parochial retention strategy. It might solve one force's problems of recruitment and retention but at the price of forces bordering that force (and others further removed if officers were prepared to re-locate). Those forces would then be obliged to increase pay so the strategy was perceived to be self defeating.

Any connection between basic pay and region would simply result in officers "chasing" pay.

The Met is already attracting officers from nearby because of the increased pay. If North Wales pays differently to Cheshire, people would just move force.

We all do the same job so should be paid the same. The cost of living here in the South East is higher, but I could move to North Yorkshire where it's cheaper to live. It's my choice. If regional pay were to say Kent gets more than North Yorkshire then their officers will want to go to Kent.

The experience of forces bordering the MPS was cited but it was not always clear whether the officers were making a case for an allowance for members of those affected forces or criticising it because of the domino effect regional pay would have for forces across the country.

I agree with regional pay as it's not reflected in the current pay structure. The public sector pays for certain jobs, depending on where you live because of the cost of housing and food. The cost of housing is more down South. Previously Surrey was just a training ground for other forces. Officers would finish their probation then they'd look to transfer. Surrey residents are paying to train officers to work elsewhere. I remember in 2000 we lost 10% of Surrey's workforce to the Met. But there is still an argument for regional allowance. Very few young officers own their home in the county. They rent or buy homes in Hampshire, Thames Valley etc.

I've got £17,000 of debt from university. I'm trying to save for a mortgage. Peers have decided to go through training and then join the Met and use the free train travel and get the extra money.

Surrey had to introduce incentives to keep officers e.g. SPPs and fuel cards. If they need to do it locally you probably will need to do it nationally later on. I transferred in from Hampshire. That's exactly what happened. They got round it in the end by introducing SPP.

Some members challenged the basis for paying regional pay because they considered the cost of living was comparable across the country. Others supported it because they considered that costs, particularly housing costs, are much higher in certain areas. Some pointed to the variation in housing costs within an area.

In the past there were quite big differences in the regions, but house prices in the suburbs of Coventry are the same as in Sevenoaks, the cost of a sandwich is same. Regional differences don't exist so strongly.

We get a regional allowance, but even within our area there are disparities in the cost of living.

In some Northern forces you could afford a bigger house and a better quality of living for the same money.

The consensus in the groups was that an increase in pay across the board was the preferred alternative. Payment of an allowance to some would mean a reduction in basic pay for others

Only three people on my rota live in Surrey. The others can't afford it. We need a national increase in basic pay to address the problem or an enhancement based on housing prices. The problem is they won't offer £3,000 to anyone without taking £3,000 away from anyone else.

6. The X Factor and Police Pay

The groups were asked to think about the negative and positive aspects of being a police officer and to consider whether the x-factor payment should take into account the risk of death and personal injury to the individual.

They began by addressing the question:

Who agrees that the element in the x-factor relating to risk of death or personal injury faced by police officers should only be paid to those officers whose roles carry such a risk?

Initially 94% of group members disagreed with this statement but for some reason that was not apparent in the discussions some members changed their views as only 71% of respondents stated on the exit questionnaire that they disagreed with this statement and 25% agreed with it.

The groups recognised they had covered most of the ground relevant to this question in the discussions on role related pay. They repeated their view that no policing post should be treated differently than any other when it came to basic salary payments, that different roles faced different forms of risk and that officers whose roles did not normally lead them into conflict situations could be called upon at any time to perform roles that did. In addition, it was repeatedly emphasised that police officers are required to put themselves 'back on duty' whenever they come across a situation requiring police intervention, thereby exposing themselves to risk. Not to do so would constitute malfeasance in a public office.

It was explained that this was just one instance of how the office of constable makes requirements of you in your private life and how you are governed by a discipline code that extends beyond the hours that you are strictly at work and expects you to conform to higher standards of behaviour than others.

You are still a police officer when you walk out of work.

The x-factor recognises all the things that can happen to you outside of work because you are a police officer.

It's like a community punishment (wearing a tag) for 30 years.

- **Off duty interventions**

Whilst walking my dog early morning I arrested 2 burglars who I caught coming out of a house carrying a plasma tv. I was on restricted duties at the time as well!

I was out shopping and there was someone lying on the pavement. People

were just walking past. I checked they were all right.

I live in another force area. I had invited a colleague and his family round for a BBQ. We heard smashing of glass and laughter at the front of the house. Some cars had been vandalised. We chased and apprehended the youths involved.

I nicked someone coming back from France on the ferry. I detained him and then handed him over to special branch when we got into port. I put myself on duty. I was not wearing any kit.

My wife (who is also a police officer) and I were walking to the pub when we passed a house where there was what proved to be a violent domestic taking place. We intervened and waited until marked patrols arrived.

I was driving through a small council estate and saw an officer facing up to a lad with a knife. I got out to help.

I can give you the log reference for this job if you like. Yesterday an off-duty police officer came across a road traffic collision and detained one of the people involved who was making off because he had been drinking.

A colleague nearly died as a result of injuries sustained whilst off-duty. He came across a serious assault. He got out of his car and identified himself as a police officer. The assailant turned on him and stabbed him 16 times.

I popped into my local for a drink and there was a domestic kicking off. I separated the two and calmed the man down.

• The effect on officers' private lives

I am a school governor. I am conscious of the fact that I must not make any statement that could be construed as political or ideological.

There's a government housing scheme for professionals like us and nurses, firemen etc that I was interested in but because of the location of the properties you can't take advantage of the scheme and live there as a police officer. You would not feel safe.

In this job you are legally obliged to get rid of any debt.

There are restrictions on your social life particularly whom you associate with. There are people whose behaviour has changed, or who are now associating with some-one who is known to us, that I can no longer socialise with.

There are people I grew up with that I am no longer able to socialise with.

In this force if you move house and don't tell the chief about it and they find out PSD will be onto you. You need the chief's approval.

I avoid certain shopping centres because of who I could bump into.

You need the chief's permission to take a second job and it can be refused. I know officers who asked to do a job in security and it was refused because it could compromise them.

Taking leave can be a problem. No-one can book holidays for June-August next year because of the Olympics. People think it's a one-off but it has happened before when there have been large events locally. Because of court warnings I can't book any leave during next January and February.

You always have to have your 'radar' switched on. You watch where police officers will sit in a pub or restaurant – invariably they choose a seat facing the door.

One of my officers has chosen to see a girl who's known to the police criminally. I'm not happy about the relationship. Unless he gives her up he will lose his vetting and that would certainly be the end of his job in firearms.

Reference was made to officers who had committed, or were accused of committing, offences for which members of the general public would receive a fine and perhaps a driving licence endorsement and who then faced an internal enquiry into the circumstances.

I was accused of using my mobile phone whilst off duty driving in another force area. I denied the offence and received a summons to court. I was cleared of the offence but PSD wanted to discipline me for not informing them, It was an alleged driving offence; not criminal. What other employer would do that?

Officers asked us if we could think of another organisation where the organisation would have a duty to investigate complaints or allegations against its employees relating to issues in their private lives. Police officers are investigated by Professional Standards Departments or their local managers because the alleged behaviour may be tantamount to bringing discredit on the force. Members were of the view that people are aware of this and make such allegations to cause officers problems at work.

People complain about you if you are a cop because they know they can get you into trouble. I went through an acrimonious divorce involving all sorts of allegations from my ex-wife. You are not an equal citizen. You are vulnerable.

My next door neighbours complained about our alleged noisy parties. I was advised to consider not having noisy parties!

Being a police officer impinges because your job, livelihood, liberty even, are at risk if you are involved in the most minor fracas.

My son was attacked and I was assaulted when I intervened. I called the local

police and I was locked up. I spent hours in a cell and then nothing happened. I was told they had to lock me up because I was a cop.

We had a PC at M who was attacked off duty. He was investigated for use of excessive force as he had come out on top.

I was out with my wife when a bloke I had arrested came up and threatened me. My wife stepped between us. She knows I can look after myself. She knew if there was a fight I would get complained about and could be done for assault.

You need to appreciate the Professional Standards department side of things. You have to think whether an association could be seen as opening you up to bribery. You can't associate with just anyone and compromise yourself. You need to think about cases that might go to court later on down the line.

Standards of behaviour of police officers are expected to be higher. You could lose your job for something a member of the public would get a Fixed Penalty Notice for. People make false allegations about things in your private life and the force has to investigate them.

I left my dog in a compound when I was at work. A neighbour called the RSPCA and contacted the police. I was advised to find alternative accommodation for her, so she now lives with my parents.

We have to be politically correct but when you're in company and you challenge a racist comment, as you have to, it's very awkward.

I keep well away from Facebook because you could be compromised by what gets written there yet if I wasn't in the job I would use it.

▪ The effect on members of the family

My wife was getting on really well with the new manageress at the place where she works. We were invited to go out for a meal with her and her husband. When we got there I recognised him as a low level criminal. I have told my wife we can't socialise with them again. It has caused tension between us and made life awkward for her at work.

My partner and I were invited to a get-together at a restaurant that had just opened. I had to decline the invitation because there was a suspicion it could be funded by criminal assets.

My daughter had been seeing this lad for a few weeks. I discovered he had form and told her she had to disassociate with him or leave home. It was very hard on all of us.

It has taken my father a long time to come to terms with the fact that I will not

meet up with relatives of my step-mother because some of them are bent.

- **Harassment**

Most of the groups referred to cases where officers had been forced to move house because of harassment and threats.

I've suffered from criminal damage and abuse in my private life. It was directed at me and my family.

I had problems when I worked on section. A prolific offender found out where I lived. I received pizza deliveries and the fire-brigade had a malicious call to my address.

Some-one is in court, as I speak, accused of harassing an officer in my team over an arrest he made 10 years ago.

Believe me there are serious criminals who'd not think twice about burning down your house or causing you serious harm. If there wasn't that risk to officers there would not be cases of police officers giving evidence behind a screen using a PIN number instead of a name.

A WPC who worked on a tough estate was harassed. They would wave a cardboard sign at her with her car registration number on it.

There are rough parts to the area where I live. I was walking my dog and this 18 year old youth approached me, high on drugs. He asked me about my job – said he'd been told I was a police officer. I was very anxious at this point. He talked about suicide. I walked to the police station. They knew him.

- **The advantages of being a police officer**

Cynical laughter was the first spontaneous response from the groups to the question asking them to what extent they agreed that the non-financial rewards of being a police officer are sufficient compensation for the restrictions on their and their families' lives, There was nothing to discuss as they could think of no examples. Only two officers agreed with the statement in their responses to the questionnaire.

You can't even accept a free cup of coffee on nights at the local petrol station.

The days of the dizzies (discounts) for the bizzys (police) are long gone.

▪ **Debt and Corruption**

On the other hand holding the office of constable provides many advantages to the corrupt police officer.

The concern about corruption emerged several times during the course of the group discussions. Group members feared that any reductions in basic pay would increase the debt problem among officers which is already on the increase. Debt could provide police officers with the motive for corruption; their office provides them with ample opportunity to satisfy it.

Financial hardships are already becoming evident among officers, with more officers declaring themselves bankrupt.

Under Winsor's proposals officers will be 20-25% worse off in the next few years. This could result in an increase in corruption.

Cases of attempted bribery are already coming to light.

We were told by an inspector on Response that his officers were more frequently than ever reporting instances where members of the public had offered bribes to avoid being reported for an offence.

If you stop a vehicle for example and someone's on the phone you get officers now where they've attempted to bribe them, saying I'll give you £50 if you drop the ticket. If they're on 9 points already. That does happen.

In the groups we were reminded about the amount of confidential information on events and people police officers have access to and that it was a precious commodity for which criminals were prepared to pay.

When the salary coming in is less than the bills going out then they are corruptible. Once you've stepped over the line as a police officer you've been bought. It could be about crimes going on, central informants, other police officers. Information about anything. As a police officer you are in possession of so much information and the potential to gather information. You would be a person on the inside and that's a dangerous position to be in. You can't step back again and the more financial difficulty people will find themselves in, especially those younger in service and vulnerable, it's going to be easy pickings to some of these drug gangs.

A supervisor told us that women officers in his force were increasingly being targeted.

We have had incidences of officers that have been targeted. Especially young female officers. They have been targeted in gyms by members of various crime groups who know they are struggling.

Some members commented that the fear and suspicion of corruption was a new dimension in the workplace which had the potential to undermine the level of trust that currently exists between colleagues.

7. Overtime Payment

The groups were asked how important they considered it was that the police service pays overtime at an attractive rate to constables and sergeants. Seventy-nine percent of respondents stated in the exit questionnaire that it was 'very important' and 21% considered it to be 'somewhat important'.

The groups were frustrated at the manner in which overtime in the police service had been portrayed in sections of the media and thought it extremely important that the myths were exploded and distortions corrected. Insufficient attention had been paid to the fact that police officers could not disobey a lawful order to work overtime and that, by their very nature, incidents they dealt with required them to work well beyond the end of their shift. Officers can be granted 'time off in lieu' as a repayment for working these hours but we were reminded that its use is limited because the service would soon reach a point where resilience was dangerously threatened.

Reference was repeatedly made to press reports of overtime being 'manufactured' but the groups insisted that if such deviance did occur it was confined to small pockets of the organisation. Their view was that it was management's responsibility to design it out rather than the remainder of the workforce having to pay for the misdemeanours of a very small minority. In contrast with the image of the 'overtime – hungry' officer it was impressed upon us that most officers would prefer to leave work at the end of their shifts, go home to their families and enjoy their free time. They were anxious about the emergence of a 'long hours' culture in the police where management would routinely expect officers to work overtime and this, together with reasonably compensating officers for sacrificing their free time, was the primary reason given for retaining the present rates of overtime. They were perceived to provide management with a pool of willing volunteers and, thereby, the flexibility to respond to demand; albeit the recent reductions in the amount of available overtime had weakened that response. Unless more officers were recruited, a reduction in the size of that pool resulting from the adoption of some of the proposals on overtime in the Consultation Document, would inevitably lead, it was thought, to a reduction in the quality of policing.

• **The overtime imperative**

Members argued that what distinguishes the police service from most other organisations is the fact that it is a disciplinary offence to disobey an order to work overtime.

You can be ordered to stay on and work overtime for any operational reason. Unless it was completely ridiculous it would be a lawful order.

Officers have no say in the matter if they are required to work overtime.

There's a special operation and you are ordered to do overtime. If it's not convenient for you they will argue 'exigencies of duty'.

It's difficult to compare overtime in the police with the rest. I have to stay on for overtime and want to be properly remunerated.

If there's an issue, a lot of police staff withdraw and we're ordered to take over. That's the disparity.

However that is not the only reason why officers feel compelled to work extra hours. Professional commitment and the concern to ensure a job is completed to their satisfaction also leave them with little choice.

*I want to ensure I do the best job I can. I may be p^{***}ed off at the organisation but I still work on. I can't hand over to someone else who doesn't know the case.*

I work in public protection so if someone's in custody and I want to protect the victim I don't want to lose the flow of the investigation and I have only got 24 hours to get someone charged. We deal with a person's safety and that's paramount. You put a value on someone's life! If you've got to stay on you've got to stay on. I couldn't not do it. It's about professionalism.

Overtime compensates officers for staying on. It enables them to give continuity to a task.

Depending on the case it is sometimes more efficient to do the overtime than hand the case over, as the quality will likely be better. Often there is no-one to pass it onto anyway.

We have to work overtime because there's not enough officers on duty to cope. I bet if you look at the amount of work to be done now and numbers of officers to do it and compare it with how it used to be you'd find the numbers are much lower these days.

They are throwing overtime at me in custody because they've implemented a change that has been mismanaged. There aren't enough staff now.

There seems to be a perception we are paid for nothing when we work overtime. The overtime is there because the job needs doing.

We have overtime to have extra time to deal with policing. If it's not paid for, the organisational resilience will go.

The link between organisational resilience and overtime was also clear in the statements of those officers who argued there were already indications that the cut-backs in overtime were having an adverse effect, particularly on proactive policing.

If you don't have overtime then people working excessive hours would have to

get time off. It's that simple. But then there would be no organisational resilience. I was a TPT inspector, silver firearms commander. I couldn't get any time off. I had 42 rest days owed after three years which I couldn't take.

There is very little overtime on offer in any event. It is different at the moment as overtime is being paid for by the Government because of the riots. However, normally when forces have to pay there is little or none available or officers are asked to work for lower rates.

I'm in surveillance. You can't clock off at the end of your tour if you are following some-one. So if there's no budget they don't start the operation.

- **Officers' abuse of overtime**

Group members related different experiences of overtime abuses by officers. The prevailing view was that it was largely a thing of the past and restricted to just a few areas. It was argued that what was claimed to be overtime abuse by officers actually stemmed from the demands of other organisations, the court in particular.

In my opinion there are some CID teams that milk overtime. Managers should be able to manage that. The system encourages it because every financial year by the end of February budgets need to be spent and then overtime is wasted on things that should not be a priority.

However, there are a minority of officers who have "mastered the art of claiming". It is a minority of officers and that mindset needs to be addressed.

Overtime is never manufactured by people in receipt of it. I've never seen it happen.

The courts take no note of rest days. If you don't turn up it's contempt. If the defendant doesn't turn up they just adjourn it.

Although it does not constitute abuse group members wanted to correct the impression that officers regularly receive double time. Some members were willing to give up part of their entitlement to it.

Double time is a rarity, it doesn't happen often and it's not across the board.

Most bank holidays I don't care about, but I would like to protect Christmas and New Year. The other bank holidays aren't family days.

- **Management's abuse of overtime**

All the groups believed managers would be compelled by budgetary pressures and the insatiable appetite for more policing, to make much greater use of officers beyond their normal working hours if the cost of overtime

payments was reduced by paying a lower rate. They had the motive. Reducing overtime payments would provide the opportunity.

It is the only protection against draconian management. Management can be very inconsiderate. Overtime is the only way management can think to plan.

It's a disincentive to the person who's prepared to disrupt your family life. They need to pay a premium to do it.

The job takes the mick. I work ridiculous hours as a DI.

We could debate the amount, but we do need to pay overtime and need to disincentivise to ensure the job only uses it when it's necessary.

If they scrap overtime pay, with less officers, there will be more 12 hour shifts for flat rate.

A lot of supervisors already try to bend overtime to suit them. They try to offer you less and a lot of people capitulate.

It's vital. I expect to be compensated for the extra work I do and I don't think the rates are that high personally. It protects me from misuse by management. The only thing preventing management from calling me in is what costs them. I've seen it in the military. It's too easy for them to put you on the gate at the weekend. I deserve to be compensated for the work I do and there has to be a brake of some type on management to stop abuse. There's an element of protecting an officer's time off.

Any job is easier with more officers so if there is no cost, management will always have more officers working

Forces are already offering lower rates than Regulations for overtime required and trying to negotiate down hours claimed for payment.

Force managers are becoming much more astute about authorising overtime. This is how it should be. It should encourage good management but it also suggests that if officers were salaried they would be open to abuse. Overtime offers some protection.

Overtime matters a lot to management and their budgets. They don't want us to work it if they can help it because they have to pay. They will cancel our rest days instead.

Like everyone else in the group I think management would abuse overtime if the payment were flat time.

As a manager I might have to ask people to work longer hours as I have a responsibility to the public to get the job done.

The groups cited the long hours worked by the Inspector rank which had

accepted a 'buy out' of overtime, as evidence of the abuse they anticipated would follow any reduction in rates.

With the buy-out, overtime was taken away from inspectors and now the job takes advantage of DIs. Some say we're mugs. It's a personal choice as I want to advance my career. If I was coming towards the end of my career, I might take a militant approach.

Inspectors' overtime was bought out but no inspector in this force keeps to 40 hrs a week. There is no disincentive for the force to stop making them work over.

• **The personal cost incurred by working overtime**

According to the groups most officers do not want overtime on a regular basis. Many do not claim for all the overtime they put in. But when they consider they deserve it they expect to be compensated adequately for the sacrifices they and their families are making.

I would prefer to cut the overtime budget in half to buy more officers, then we could work less overtime as there would be more officers working.

It is a myth that officers generally want to work overtime. They would rather be at home. Winsor is mistaken in this view.

Officers already often work for free, coming in early for shifts and working on without claiming.

Officers come in before their shifts starts anyway so they are ready to go out when they take over. Possibly an hour a day is being worked for nothing

Officers work a half hour for nothing but in reality there is more good will than that - people are really flexible about coming in when they are needed. There has to be compensation for short notice. Everything else has to be put on hold, for example cancelling arrangements with family.

It is an inconvenience, but if I stay on half the time I don't claim for it. I accept that if you have a family and you stay on, you might want to be compensated.

My shifts involving working long hours. I'm not looking for overtime. I'd prefer to go home. I typically go a shift without a break. If I then stay on late to deal with something I still don't have a break as I'll end up staying longer. It makes them long old shifts.

I've been in CID for the last three months and done about 45 hours overtime. I had to stay on. After ten hours you're demoralised knowing you've got to be back early the next day. Is time and a third unreasonable?

We struggle to find people to stay for overtime as it is.

Working very long hours with little sleep plays havoc with your home life. I don't expect a great deal but I would like that time and a third.

I'll try to do as little overtime as possible. When I do I miss seeing my son.

We already miss children's birthdays, Christmas dinners etc

You don't see your wife - you just make a lot of phone calls about not coming home, missing things with kids. If you work beyond contracted hours you need to get paid more. The only way I get away with it is by saying to my wife, the money will pay for a holiday etc.

You have got to compensate people properly for messing up their social life and the stresses and strains of long hours at work.

The day before yesterday two DCs worked 8 am until 3 am then came back in at 8 am. They've earned overtime but had 2 hrs sleep. The least we can do is pay them some compensation.

You often have to stay on but sometimes you will get time off instead of pay. Most officers would prefer to take time off instead of payment.

If overtime payments are taken away, officers won't answer their phone because of the fear that it could be work. Why would you put yourself out when you've already worked your allocated hours for the week?

My old DI did stupid hours as he had such a passion for the job but that goodwill is gradually going and it will definitely end if payment goes.

If we are paid at flat rate people will say they've had a drink so can't come in.

The responses on the exit questionnaire to the question asking them if they agreed that overtime should be bought out for those particular posts where there is an expectation of working longer hours are consistent with what was stated in the groups.

81% strongly disagreed, 9% somewhat disagreed.

Similarly 82% strongly disagreed and 9% disagreed with a buy out of overtime for all ranks.

There is a strong suspicion from comments made during the discussion that officers near to retirement would have voted in favour although they remained opposed to the proposals in principle.

8. Unsocial Hours Payment

The discussions in the groups on this issue indicate that it is not possible to draw any firm conclusions from the responses to the exit questionnaire question which asked respondents to what extent they agreed that those police officers, whose posts require them to work unsocial hours regularly, should receive an additional payment.

Different definitions were offered of what constitutes unsocial hours and there were various interpretations of how regularly such hours would have to be worked to qualify. Different ideas were expressed about what an unsocial hours allowance aimed to compensate its recipients for. Was it disruption of their out - of - work lives? The damaging effect of working those hours on their health and if so which were the most harmful? Or was it intended to reward a willingness to perform hard to fill posts?

With so many competing definitions and interpretations entering the discussions it was to be expected that members would fail to agree on the posts which would qualify for the allowance.

Twenty one percent of questionnaire respondents strongly disagreed and 19% disagreed with the suggestion but it is impossible to conclude from this finding whether they objected in *principle* to the proposal or were implying they could not agree to it until the ambiguity surrounding the definitions was resolved and they were clearer about how it was to be implemented. By the same token the 19% who strongly agreed and the 35% who agreed may have been agreeing to the principle but had different ideas about the hours and the posts qualifying for the award.

Group members did share one very important concern, however. They feared that the hours selected for an additional payment would be the target if budget holders had to make cuts, leaving those shifts understaffed.

The following quotations illustrate the need for greater clarity before this proposal can be assessed accurately.

What are unsocial hours?

Each person has a different perception of what unsocial means to them. It depends on individual circumstances

Different hours suit different people. Some may want to work nights for childcare reasons. I'm not sure it's fair that they'd then get more.

I'm more disrupted working Saturday afternoon as I play rugby. I don't mind working Friday and Saturday night. I'd happily work every Friday and Saturday nights regularly.

I think 8pm until 6 am is generally acceptable as unsocial.

8 pm is too early to be unsocial.

Is it working unsocial hours or the frequency you work them?

We all work antisocial hours.

If it is once in a blue moon you should not expect to get paid for it.

How do you define it? When would it get paid? I don't work beyond 10pm most nights, but on occasions I will. Will it be like overtime e.g. after 3 shifts in a week? Or will it be like an on call allowance? You need to know how it's going to work before you can decide.

I'm not on a permanent shift system but I get called out days and nights. Will it be pro-rata?

How will it be affected by flexible shift working patterns? You have a right to flexible working. There is already a provision there where they have to consider flexible working patterns.

How will it work? If you are called to court during the day, would you lose the night shift allowance? That would be unfair.

We seem to be agreeing on the principle but the 'devil's in the detail' - calculating what is or isn't unsocial.

All officers will work shifts at some point so it is fairer to leave it as it is.

The job is a 24/7 organisation so you knew you'd have to work nights. I don't agree you should get extra money for that. I hate doing nights, but we're expected to be there.

I've been on TPT for seven years. Next week I leave for PPIU and won't be working weekends (or one in three). I won't be doing nights. Do I deserve the same money for PPIU as TPT? I don't deserve less in basic salary but I don't deserve an extra payment for being on PPIU as I'm getting my weekends back. TPT deserve a bit extra - not additional salary, but an enhancement .

I don't see why night response should get more. I'm going on to TPT. I knew I'd have unsociable hours. I accepted that.

I do think 24/7 should get more.

The 24/7 shift system is no more unsocial than what I do. It's a rotating shift, but they are told up to 6 weeks in advance and they can plan around that.

What decides what's disruptive is whether your shifts are planned ahead or not. I don't agree Response should get more for that reason. Their duties are

pre-planned six weeks in advance. I don't know now what I'll be working tomorrow. My duty time can change in blink of an eye. That's unsocial.

On E team we'd start at 8pm Monday night and maybe do the same on the Tuesday night. You're starting on Delhi time on Monday and then trying to get back to London time for the weekend.

If you're on a fixed shift then 'no' but if you're on a rotating pattern you should get it because of the effect on your body clock.

It's the rotational element rather than fixed shift - disrupted sleep and family life.

I think it's worse working through the night. The older you get, the harder it gets.

You suffer ill health if you have to change from nights to days within the space of one week, rather than if you've got a shift rotation within three weeks.

People with childcare commitments who want to work nights should still get it as it is unsocial and bad for your health.

• The cost borne by others

As with other proposals, realising there was no new money on the table there was a concern about the measure being introduced at the price of a cut in salaries of other posts.

I feel the principle is sound but where's the money coming from?

I'm concerned about funding this at the expense of someone else's basic pay. Some roles never require shift working and it would be unfair to penalise officers in those roles.

Those in favour of the allowance made the following suggestions:

Take the money from the SPP pot.

Get rid of PCSOs (not approved by all)

The rank structure is top heavy. Adjust that.

Take Commanders' bonuses.

- **Undesirable consequences**

Officers would not want to move into a role that paid less.

If people are tied into those better paid roles that will restrict movement between roles.

The bosses have to run very strict budgets and if they see an area where they can save money, they will do it. If this came in shifts would start to change. You'll have less people on nights and, more on days so they won't have to pay out as much.

It would be easy for management to say 'we're short on money so on TPT we'll have six on lates instead of nine'.

I'm not against it in principle but I'm against the possible abuses. We'd need to see how they will implement it

- **Shift working – a case study**

One sergeant felt so strongly about the impact working unsocial hours had on her life and that of her husband (who is also a police officer) that she sent an email after attending the group. Her story is also relevant to the x-factor payment.

She considered that it would be impossible to single out particular posts for a shift allowance.

'I would suggest, that no matter what job people are in, they have to work unsocial hours. All officers whether dealing with front line incidents / prisoners / witnesses or victims are often required to stay on at the end of their tour of duty, unexpectedly. Therefore, I feel it would be difficult to introduce payments to certain officers. Each office role I know can still incur having to work unsocial hours, DRMU during the riots, tutor units when they have student officers, CSD when working lates etc etc.

Her email went on to provide a small case study illustrating how shift working affected her life.

My husband is a response Inspector based at L. He is currently on a 5 week shift cycle.

I am a Neighbourhood Sgt based at F and am on a 9 week shift cycle.

We have a six year old child.

We are by no means an exception as there are numerous married couples within the force (who face double paycuts to our family income).

I have always wanted to be a front line officer and work shifts, I enjoy my job and feel I make a difference within the communities I Police. This meant when my husband (an officer with 20yrs service, all on response shifts) and I wanted to start a family we had to give careful consideration to how we could manage child care. The general public / media make out that we have the option of paying "like everyone else" for a nursery. However, there are no nurseries that open at 0600hrs so I can drop a child off before an early shift. There are no nurseries that would stay open until anywhere between 2200hrs and 0300hrs for me to collect my child after an afternoon shift and there are certainly no nurseries which work through the night allowing me to drop my child off at 2000hrs and collect him again at 0800hrs after working a night shift! All on differing days each week and with the risk that we can't collect the child at the arranged time due to being kept on at work.

She went on to explain that her parents have relocated and moved closer so they can provide child care for her son.

If I paid them the rate I would have to pay a nanny then I couldn't afford my mortgage and would effectively be working at a huge loss.

Her email highlighted the flexibility and the amount of lateral movement across posts which had been emphasised repeatedly in the focus groups.

Over the 6 years of my son's life my husband and I have been moved shifts and roles (as we would expect to be, as police officers) which has led to us working on the same shift pattern where my son had to live with my parents for 7 days in every 5 weeks as we were on nights. We have worked complete opposite shifts where we never get a day off together, this eases the burden on my parents but means my son never sees his parents together and is not conducive to a happy marriage. We have worked different shift patterns (as we are at the moment) where we get some week days off together but in a 12 month period have only had 3 weekends off together (excluding annual leave) which is pertinent now that my son is at school and we cannot see him the same when we are off during the week.

I have lost count of the number of times I have rang my parents and said "I won't be finished on time, I don't know what time I will get off". Sometimes this has led to them keeping my son overnight at short notice or at times, if my son has already been put to bed at my house, it has left my Father sitting at our house until 4am.

We don't complain about it because we love our job, we care about our job we are proud of what we do and I would hate to have to leave.

If all of Winsor 1 was implemented my husband and I would face an average decrease of around £700-£750 a month which is a daunting thought.

9. Short Term Commissions

In response to the question to what extent they would support or oppose the introduction of short term commissions in the police service 80% stated they would strongly oppose it and 13% stated they would somewhat oppose it. Members again queried the proposal; to which perceived problems was it a solution? The service already had a procedure for dealing with unsatisfactory performance and officers could resign at any time within the notice period.

This could be an easy way to get rid of the people who are underperforming.

The force already has the ability to use UPP to get rid of officers whose performance is unsatisfactory. The use of 5 year contracts just seems to be a way of making it easier but that's the fault of the UPP.

You have the probation period - two years to assess someone and get rid if they don't make the standard.

Officers can leave at any point if they wish to with a month's notice.

If officers want to see whether being a constable is appropriate for them they can join first as a special.

Some argued it would make it easier for those who wanted to leave after 25 years service by removing the existing financial penalty.

It can give an officer a way out early so it's helpful to have formal cut-off points.

As it is you are tied to your pension. Officers with twenty-two or more years' service do feel bound by the double accrual offered in the pension scheme. If this disparity were evened out it might allow officers to leave between twenty and thirty years rather than hanging on to collect their full pension.

More dubious underlying motives were imputed.

It's a direct threat to the office of constable. It's them turning us into employees, but we're not.

We are not talking about commissions as I experienced them in the military. They are talking about contracts.

It's redundancy by the back door. At the set point they can get rid of you if they want to reduce numbers. It's so they don't have to sign them up to a pension scheme.

It's to give better control over numbers.

Most would never reach 10 years on the pay scale.

It would go like the army. It is continually renewing itself with young people who can fight. The police service is different it needs people with experience. Also the army has closer supervision so there is less requirement to use individual discretion. There are many more tiers and much more direction by supervisors.

It was argued that recruits would be unlikely to spend longer than the minimum contract term, given the prospect that it might not be renewed. The time spent as a constable would not equip them for many jobs outside.

The skills obtained in the police service are not readily transferrable. Therefore short term commissions are unsuitable. People would go into other careers immediately the contract was up.

I've heard the argument that if you are going to attract high quality graduates, the new workforce, you have to recognise they don't see themselves having a job for life. They envisage themselves having five or six jobs during their career. But in the police it's different. You need to retain experience.

The groups debated whether it was in the interests of the police service to encourage applications from people who had no ambition to stay in the police for longer than 5 years or so. If they had to fund the cost of training themselves they would probably not apply and if the service had to pay for it each time the cost would be prohibitive. Members were convinced their job commitment would be less and imputed more devious motives to others.

Short term contracts will lead to a similar psyche to the people who join the military but don't intend to stay for long. You'll get a transitional workforce without that level of experience and understanding we need.

Why would you do it – what would it qualify you for? Your first years are your apprenticeship as a career police officer, then you can move on to specialise.

If the job takes five people on, teaches them everything, then at end of five years after they will have invested thousands of pounds on them, they resign (or they may have to get rid) at some point the job is going to have to take on more officers and train them. They wouldn't have saved any money. It's not necessarily in the organisation's interest to get rid of them. But it might get rid of dead wood.

People wouldn't pay for their own training for a 5 year contract.

If short term commissions are introduced, more members of the public will have been in for 5 years and left, therefore they may know more about how to commit crime and how to get away with it. The opportunity for corruption is there.

The dedication will go with short term commissions.

Police officers on short term commissions are not investing as much in the Service and could be more open to corruption as they will be leaving within a few years.

People on 5 year contract won't be prepared to accept the restrictions than come with the job. With the years service I have in I have a lot to lose if I behave badly. If you're only in for the short term you won't have that commitment.

Policing is a vocation. You don't want people to doing it short term. You risk losing the money invested in training and taking the knowledge they've got away with them. It seems completely wrong.

With short term commissions you would recruit people who had no long - term commitment to the police. Therefore they may be more susceptible to corruption.

The downside is that it won't get people into the service who want to make it a vocation or a life career and some that do who will fall victim to job cuts. It's happening in the Army. Some join as officers to make a career. But then someone projects they're not needed in the future and they have to leave. You lose a lot of experience.

The majority of officers in the groups stated they would not have joined the police under a short-term contract arrangement.

I would not have joined up with that uncertainty. It will put people off joining.

We previously had problems with recruitment. It might happen again.

I wouldn't join on a contract - I joined for life and provided I am contributing it should be up to me if I leave.

Contrasting present arrangements with those proposed, members reflected on how it would have arrested their development and revealed their concerns about the impact on their own finances, particularly their pensions, and their ability to plan their futures.

Presumably you would just be doing one role in the five years? That is bad for progression.

There's masses of career development after those five years.

As a DI I want people with a good grounding coming into my department. Those coming in for 5 years would be limited in their capacity.

It takes 5 years to learn how to do the job. During the next 5-10 years you become more productive.

Police pensions are dependent on contributions from new joiners. People won't join the pension if they only intend to serve for 5 years. What will the effect of that be?

What about maternity issues. How could a female officer plan her family. Wouldn't the adoption of this proposal amount to discrimination? It would be limiting her career prospects. There would be paternity issues as well.

How would you get a mortgage, plan for university for your kids?

The big carrot for everyone is the pension. If you are going to dedicate yourself for a vocation you want stability. The dedication will go with short term commissions.

Having considered the disadvantages of the short term contracts the groups considered contracts with longer break points. They could find no justification for these and thought they would be designed to enable forces to shed officers if funding required it.

The only advantage is for the Treasury and forces if they want to get rid of people for budgetary reasons.

It gives the organisation more flexibility. When you need less staff it gives managers the ability to get rid of people.

10. Direct Entry

Groups were asked to what extent they would support the idea of direct entry to the police service at a rank other than police constable. Across all groups 81% were strongly opposed to the suggestion, 9% somewhat opposed and 4% were in support of it.

It was clear from the outset that this question referred to policing posts carrying an operational responsibility. There were no objections to direct entry into specialist posts eg directors of IT or Finance.

The discussions usually opened with an enquiry as to why this suggestion had been made. What problem was direct entry intended to address and were there better internal solutions to it? If the problem stemmed from the fact that senior officers were promoted too quickly the appointment of managers from outside the service who had no experience at all in the lower ranks, would presumably accentuate it. The appropriateness of the army model of direct entry was challenged, particularly by ex-service personnel. It was held to be important that the lower ranks had confidence in their senior officers especially they were acting in a silver or gold commander role.

Where's the evidence for Winsor to say we need direct entry?

I need to clarify we are not asking about senior police staff such as finance directors.

It is more appropriate for non-operational roles at a senior level. Senior police officers could then be more reflective of their communities via positive action.

You have to think about the effect on those lower down the rank structure. This would create glass ceilings and those working their way up from within would have their path blocked.

In the armed forces you don't get anyone coming in at colonel level so what level do they intend in the police?

In the army there is direct entry at officer level. This results in a 2 tier force. Officers are treated very differently and they don't really understand the lower ranks. They have to learn a lot from platoon sergeants. It is a bad model for the police to adopt. I'm very against it. I had a very short career in military. We'd go to a rating and officer situation.

- **Experience of policing in the lower ranks seen as indispensable**

The service tried bringing direct entry in for chief officers in the past and it didn't work.

Officers who come out of specialist posts back to frontline policing are often out of touch and have to brush up their knowledge. Bringing someone in with no policing experience would be even worse.

Senior officers need experience of all ranks. Police work should be managed by people with police experience.

Leaders needed to have operational experience and understand the frontline. I don't want to be overseen by someone with no policing experience. Who would be the gold and silver commanders for major incidents?

Imagine someone with no CID experience acting as the Senior Investigation Officer in a murder enquiry.

You earn respect by doing the job based on experience

You can't learn from any other role out there. It's like building a wall, you need the foundation.

I had a meeting with a civvie manager about overtime claims. I had to explain to him what happens on an operation, how the overtime was incurred and why. He thanked me for explaining. What if he had been planning that operation?

The role of special advisors was discussed and the minority in favour of the suggestion proposed their advice would compensate for a commander's lack of experience.

It might be appropriate to have people transfer in at a higher level e.g. commander. They would make decisions based on the advice of people around them with operational experience.

Yes they have Tac Advisors now. I'm a POLSA adviser but remember they don't have to take my advice. They have to be able to choose from the options.

Senior managers do take advice from constables and sergeants e.g. POLSA is a good example. I'll give advice on kidnapping. They need to be aware those options are there. They always make sure that people who get beyond chief inspector have crime group experience.

I disagree that advisers compensate. The decision has to rest with someone who has the experience. You don't always have time to consult others

- **Improving the quality of senior officers by internal measures**

There are Supers who are not doing a good job but that should be tackled internally. It seems their poor performance is never dealt with by the Service but there is a procedure.

You can have people in senior posts who've never been operational as supervisors or managers. They end up as a super and sometimes even beyond that.

There is a natural pool of talent in the service that is adequate for its needs. Those individuals just need to receive the right support. They need to be given roles and time to develop into them instead of clambering as fast as they can up the 'greasy pole'.

There should be better management training within the service. We should invest in what we've got.

I meet lots of young officers brimming with potential. I urge young officers like them to take the promotion exams now.

I'm keen to do the sergeants exam, but I don't agree with the High Potential Development Scheme – jumping the ranks - as you need a good basis in policing. Not all of my peers think like that.

After two years I went for my sergeant's exam but didn't feel I had enough time in to tell colleagues with longer service what to do. Now I have four and a half years. I'm in a much better position. I'd encourage everyone to do it; to get the experience and knowledge. It doesn't always happen and that's the problem.

It's not always the fault of the commander. They have changes imposed on them by external bodies. Too many consultants who don't listen to us on the ground.

We restructured Response so that they passed crimes back to a different place. A divide came in where a "not my job" culture came in. After 6 months the job queue got longer, detection rates went down. So we went back to previous system. Later another lot of consultants came in and recommended the same model and the bosses had to implement it even though we advised against it.

11. Conclusion

Police officers in the Federated ranks have spoken for themselves in this report. In concluding I draw attention to 4 themes which ran through each of the discussions.

1. Ensuring that the complexity of policing and its impact on the lives of police officers was fully understood and recognised in determining police pay.
2. Concern about the impact of Winsor 1 recommendations on their financial position and the prospect Winsor 2 would make it worse.
3. Concern about police officers going into debt and the possibility some may be unable to resist the temptation to exploit the many opportunities policing provides to make money corruptly.
4. Concern that inappropriate measures are taken to address organisational issues which could be resolved if existing systems were to be operated and managed correctly.

The findings of this research parallel in certain respects those reported by Greenstreet Berman Ltd⁸ in its report to the Independent Review of Police Officers and Staff Remuneration and Conditions Team on the analysis of responses provided to an online consultation. However, it suggests a more cautious interpretation of those responses given the ambiguity of the terminology highlighted in this report. If the reports are read together it will be recognised that had Berman configured the data differently their findings may have been closer to those reported here.

⁸ Analysis of response to Police Review of Remuneration and Conditions for officers and staff. Report to CI Strategic Consultancy by Greenstreet Berman GSB Ref:CL2461 2010

Appendix 1 – Exit Questionnaire

This questionnaire is intended to supplement the information gathered in the focus group. We would be grateful if you could record your views on the issues raised.

1. How long have you been a police officer?

_____years_____months

2. What is your present job?

3. What job do you see yourself doing in the last 4 years of your service?

4. What is your gender?

In the following questions please circle the answer that most closely represents your view.

5. How satisfied are you with the incremental pay scale as a method of determining your level of pay?

Very dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
----------------------	--------------------------	--	-----------------------	-------------------

6. To what extent would you agree that some police officers within the same rank should be paid more than other police officers within that rank because of the job they do?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

7. To what extent would you agree that a police officer's level of pay should take into account the accredited qualifications they have acquired and the amount of professional development they have undertaken?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

8. To what extent would you agree that a police officer's pay should be related to their performance?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

9. To what extent would you agree that if a police officer's performance falls below the accepted standard then their pay should be reduced until their performance is brought back up to standard - the "at risk" element of pay?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

10. To what extent would you agree that police officers living in certain areas should receive higher levels of pay than those living elsewhere?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

11. To what extent would you agree that the element in the X Factor payment relating to risk of death or personal injury faced by police officers should only be paid to those officers whose roles carry such a risk?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

12. To what extent would you agree that the non-financial rewards of being a police officer are sufficient compensation for the restrictions on their and their families' private lives?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

13. How important is it that the police service pays overtime at an attractive rate to constables and sergeants?

Very unimportant	Somewhat unimportant	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat important	Very important
------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	----------------

14. To what extent would you agree that overtime should be bought out for those particular posts where there is an expectation of working longer hours?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

15. To what extent would you agree that overtime should be bought out for officers in all ranks and posts?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

16. To what extent would you agree that those police officers whose posts require them to work unsocial hours regularly should receive an additional payment?

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	----------------

17. To what extent would you support or oppose the introduction of short term commissions in the police service?

Strongly oppose	Somewhat oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat support	Strongly support
-----------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------	------------------

18. To what extent would you support or oppose the idea of direct entry to the police service at a rank other than police constable?

Strongly oppose	Somewhat oppose	Neither support nor oppose	Somewhat support	Strongly support
-----------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------	------------------

THANK YOU