

## WINSOR II – RED RECOMMENDATIONS

### METROPOLITAN POLICE FEDERATION COMMENTS

Please find below all of the recommendations from the Winsor II report and some early comments from us about them. At this stage these are simply recommendations and we await the decision of the Home Secretary as how she intends to deal with them. Cognisant of the feedback from members following the publication of Winsor 1 and bearing in mind Winsor 2 amounts to 800 pages, we hope you find this breakdown a more user friendly way of accessing this information. Our comments do not indicate any negotiating position, and are highlighted as follows:-

White Background- Either does not affect Federated ranks or there is insufficient information to provide detailed comment.

Green - broadly welcomed.

Amber - Some dangers to the future pay and conditions of police officers.

Red - Severe risk to the future pay and conditions of police officers.

Peter Smyth  
Chairman  
Met Police Federation

<p><b>Recommendation 8</b> - From August 2013, a national Direct Entry (Inspector) scheme should be established with the objective of improving police leadership and offering rapid training and promotion to individuals of high ability and capacity. It should be run by the Police Professional Body with the co-operation of police forces. The intake should be set annually, with at least 80 participants in each intake. Around half of the scheme members should be external graduates and half in-service officers and police staff members. The scheme should be rigorous and highly selective.</p>	<p>Whilst different from the current High Potential Development Scheme (HPDS) it covers the same ground. What is missing is any grounding in the office of Constable. Such experience is vital in ensuring that future leaders of the service have an understanding of what policing is actually about rather than ratified concepts of what it might be like.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 19</b> - A national scheme for recruitment directly to the rank of superintendent should be established and brought into operation from September 2013. Participation in the scheme should be at the</p>	<p>A basic grounding in operational policing is vital for all police officers and particularly so with those who will be charged with making operational decisions.</p>

discretion of the chief officer. The scheme should last 15 months. Participants on the scheme should be persons of exceptional achievement and ability who have been assessed as having the potential to be senior police officers. They should be paid as superintendents on the lowest pay point whilst on the course. The knowledge, skill and experience required for them to operate competently and confidently as full superintendents should be delivered through a mixture of in-force training and an 18-week course of instruction at the police college.

If policing needs Business managers and HR professionals it should recruit such people for those roles. If it needs operational policing leaders they should be operational police officers. The public scrutiny of policing is too intense to allow for high level policing decisions to be made by persons with insufficient knowledge of policing. To rely on junior officers to “catch” the mistakes is unfair and unrealistic. In force training and a course of instruction whilst useful cannot replace genuine police experience. It is likely that such a scheme will affect the opportunities of officers already in the service and therefore reduce motivation amongst Chief Inspectors seeking Superintendent’s roles. The fact that SCPO support such a scheme is a total condemnation of their policies on promotion and training. Had they promoted the right people with the right skills then such a direct entry system would surely never have been deemed necessary.

**Recommendation 20** - The scheme (recommendation 19) should be operated by the Police Professional Body, which should also meet the costs of the scheme, other than the support provided to scheme members by forces. It should be the decision of each Chief Constable whether or not his force will participate in the scheme. There should be an objective (but not a firm target) of there being 20% of superintendents recruited as direct entrants within ten years of the first superintendents completing the scheme in November 2015.

A target of 20% of Superintendents being recruited in this way is unrealistic, it would inevitably lead to such officers being forced into the most critical of posts. Bronze and Silver Commanders of major public order events? Gold Commander of firearms operations?. Senior Investigating Officers of linked homicides? The dangers to the service and the reputation of policing are too great to allow for these recruits to learn as they go.

<p><b>Recommendation 22</b> - The direct entry scheme for superintendents should be reviewed after a period of five years.</p>	<p>To allow for such a radical scheme to run for 5 years before being reviewed is foolhardy in the extreme. It should be subject to constant continual review.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 33</b> - A fitness test should be introduced in September 2013 for all police officers and staff required to undertake personal safety training. Participants should be required to attain level 5:4 on a 15-metre shuttle run. From September 2014, those who fail the test three times should be subject to the appropriate disciplinary procedures.</p>	<p>A fitness test seems inevitable but without any provision to allow officers to prepare for such a test it is doomed to cause problems. The Taylor reforms to Misconduct are unambiguous in their intention to create a culture of learning and development rather than blame and punishment. To threaten misconduct and financial penalties without any support to pass such tests is unacceptable. There also seems no provision for injured officers. Such a policy will also require a detailed Equality Impact Assessment.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 34</b> - From September 2018, an annual physical fitness test should be introduced for all police officers in England and Wales, equivalent to the test used for recruits in the Police Service of Northern Ireland.</p>	<p>A more stringent test. Again without any support mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 38</b> - The Police Regulations 2003 should be amended to specify the procedure for determining the circumstances in which an officer may be placed on restricted duty, the arrangements which a Chief Constable may make for officers on restricted duty, and the adjustments to the pay of such officers.</p>	<p>There is already a system for placing officers on restricted duty. This recommendation makes no distinction between officers injured in the execution of their duty and others. It threatens financial penalties which is unacceptable.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 39</b> - From September 2014, officers on restricted duty should have their deployability and capability to exercise police powers assessed one year after being placed on restricted duty. Officers who are not deployable and are not capable of work which requires the office of constable should sustain a reduction in</p>	<p>Again no distinction between officers injured in the execution of their duty and other injuries. To fine an officer who has been injured in the execution of duty is totally unacceptable. Force policy has severely restricted the number of officers allowed to medically</p>

<p>pay equal to the value of the deployability element of the X-factor, namely the lower of eight <i>per cent</i> and £2,922 <i>per annum</i>. After a further year, appropriate proceedings should be initiated to dismiss or retire these officers from the police service on the grounds of incapability or poor attendance. Officers who are permanently disabled from working as police officers should be ill-health retired. Those who are not permanently disabled should be given the opportunity to resign as police officers and immediately take up a police staff job on police staff terms and conditions, if one is available.</p>	<p>retire. Where the disability is not permanent officers should be given every opportunity to achieve operational deployability.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 40</b> - A former officer who resigns to take a police staff job or who is dismissed on the grounds of incapability or poor attendance following the restricted duty process, should be entitled to be considered for re-appointment if, following an assessment by an approved medical practitioner, the condition which previously compromised his capability is judged to have permanently changed so as to restore his ability to work as a police officer. Without the former officer having to go through the full selection process, the force should be required actively to consider whether a suitable vacancy at the former officer's rank exists or is likely to exist in the coming year. The force should have this duty for a period of five years after the officer has left.</p>	<p>A bureaucratic nightmare which would not be needed if appropriate time and support were given to injured officers in the first place.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 41</b> - A returning officer should have an unblemished disciplinary record and be able to pass the fitness test. Forces should also assess carefully a record of poor attendance. Such former officers should be on probation for six months.</p>	<p>As Recommendation 40.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 45</b> - A future police pension scheme should determine the size of a police officer's pension, when he is retiring on the grounds of ill-health, by considering both his length of service and his future capacity for regular employment.</p>	<p>Ill Health retirement is not hastily considered by the force, if an officer is permanently disabled from fulfilling the role of a police officer he/she must be given their full pension entitlement. Many officers may have been paid civil claims for their injuries some years earlier, had compulsory medical retirement on a reduced pension being a consideration these settlements could have been much higher and cannot now be re considered.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 46</b> - The Police Regulations 2003 should be amended to create a system of compulsory severance for police officers with less than full pensionable service from April 2013.</p>	<p>Totally unnecessary. This appears to fundamentally change the position of police officers being Crown Servants and moves it to a position of police officers being "employees". However there is no mention of police officer's being given any form of Industrial Rights to redress the balance.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 47</b> - The Police Regulations 2003 should be amended to provide for the payment of financial compensation to police officers with less than full pensionable service who leave the police service by reason of compulsory severance. Forces should be empowered. to offer financial compensation on the same terms as are available under the Civil Service Compensation Scheme 2010.</p>	<p>Totally unnecessary Policing is a vocation, and the office of Constable is the bedrock of British policing, this recommendation attacks the very heart of that concept.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 53</b> - The current maximum basic pay for constables should remain at £36,519.</p>	<p>Given the current pay freeze, there is no allowance for inflation and given the recommendations about a pay review body only increasing salary when recruitment and retention are an issue, the intention seems to be that this pay rate will stay for many years to come with no uprating.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 54</b> - A new, shorter pay scale for constables should be introduced for new entrants from April 2013 as outlined in Table 7.12 of this report. It should have a lower starting salary than the current scale, but should allow constables to move to the maximum more quickly.</p>	<p>£19,000 p.a. for recruits is woefully low. Recruits from CSO's would earn £21,000 still nearly £3000 LESS than their CSO salary so there is no incentive for CSO's to join as warranted police officers.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 57</b> – The London lead for the inspecting ranks in the London forces should be maintained in the short-term. The police pay review body should consider the London lead in its first review. Unless the pay review body is satisfied that the inspecting ranks in London do indeed have greater responsibilities and workloads than their counterparts elsewhere, the London lead should be abolished.</p>	<p>The London lead on pay for Inspecting ranks is well established and evidence based. Any threat to the current salary structure for London Inspectors could have catastrophic effects on future applications. All data available suggests London Inspectors already work substantially more hours than elsewhere.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 73</b> - The new police pay review body should review the level and scope of regional allowances for police officers. The national rate of basic pay should only be raised if justified by recruitment and retention problems in force areas with the least competitive labour markets. Local recruitment and retention problems should be solved through an enhanced system of regional allowances. The pay review body should begin this work in its first review.</p>	<p>There is no allowance for inflation and to only give police officers a rise in basic pay when recruitment and retention becomes an issue is unacceptable.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 74</b> - Chief Constables should be given discretion to pay regional allowances up to the current maximum level, as set out in Determination Annex U made under Regulation 34 of the Police Regulations 2003, and the discretion to apply eligibility criteria based on location and performance.</p>	<p>Regional allowances are, according to Winsor designed to assist with recruitment and retention issues and according to us to deal with differences in the cost of living across regions, they cannot be based on performance.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 79</b> - The Police Professional Body should amend the current NPJA PDR model to make it fit for use as the basis of contribution-related pay in the police service. This will involve: (a) reducing the number of box markings to three and giving clear definitions of each; (b) taking account of continuous professional development in the final box-marking; (c) including a record of attendance in the PDR; (d) taking account of whether the officer has passed the new fitness test; (e) developing guidance for the use of moderation panels to ensure force-level consistency, and forced distribution to identify the least effective 10% of officers and staff.</p>	<p>Despite years of trying there has never been a fair, objective, annual appraisal system. Any genuine drive to introduce a good appraisal system is to be welcomed, but the associated bureaucracy could prove far too costly.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 80</b> -The amended NPJA PDR template, and its accompanying guidance, should be established as the minimum standard for appraisal in the police service. Forces should be at liberty to develop and improve the PDR system thus established, but they should not disturb or eliminate its essential features. Forces should abide by its guidance, particularly in relation to (a) minimising bureaucracy; and (b) working on the assumption of competence.</p>	<p>See Recommendation 79.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 81</b> - The amended NPJA PDR should be used in all forces in England and Wales beginning in 2014/15. Training should be given in advance to all line managers to ensure that they can use the PDR efficiently and effectively, so as to inspire confidence in the system and its operation.</p>	<p>See Recommendation 79. I suspect it will take more than some training to inspire confidence!</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 82</b> - Forced distribution should be used to identify the least effective 10% of officers and staff. The forced distribution should be decided upon in moderation panels. Line managers of officers and staff who are the least effective 10% of performers must consider the use of unsatisfactory performance procedures for</p>	<p>A presumption that 10% of officers are unsatisfactory is unacceptable. Where there are unsatisfactory officers there proper procedures already in place which should be utilised without the need for quotas.</p>

<p>officers and the equivalent procedures for police staff. A written note must be made explaining what action was taken, and why, in the case of each individual.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 83</b> - Competence Related Threshold Payments should be abolished by April 2013 at the latest, and all accrued CRTP payments up to that date should be made on a prorated basis.</p>	<p>These are part of the pay package, officers have paid pension contributions on this money and it should not be taken away from them. Despite Winsor's protestations that Winsor II is completely separate from his first report, this proves that he is simply revisiting the decision of the Police Arbitration Tribunal, who have independently already rejected this proposal and their decision was accepted by the Home Secretary.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 84</b> - Pay progression for officers in the Federated ranks should be subject to a satisfactory box marking in the annual appraisal. Those officers who receive a box marking of 'satisfactory contribution' or above should advance by one pay increment; those who receive an 'unsatisfactory contribution' box marking should remain on the same pay point for a further year. This should be introduced for sergeants, inspectors and chief inspectors in 2014/15 and for constables in 2015/16.</p>	<p>Again this predisposes that there will be an efficient, fair, objective appraisal system.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 103</b> - The Police Regulations 2003 should be amended to provide the Commissioners of the Metropolitan Police with the authority to determine an appropriate level of buy-out of the casual overtime of specialist protection officers.</p>	<p>The only possible motive for this is to pay officers less for the hours they work. If the cost of protection officers overtime is too high there should be more protection officers.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 104</b> - The Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police should determine an appropriate buy-out of the casual overtime of specialist protection officers which results in a greater harmonisation of the pay of specialist and</p>	<p>As Recommendation 103.</p>



<p>royalty protection officers, and which takes appropriate account of the unique requirements of specialist protection officers.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 115</b> - The Police Negotiating Board should be abolished and replaced by an independent police officer pay review body by late 2014.</p>	<p>This would remove any ability to negotiate, it also removes the right to arbitration. It would leave police officers unable to negotiate, unable to arbitrate and unable to take any action to press any justified claim. This is totally unacceptable.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 116</b> - The membership and terms of reference for the new police pay review body should be as specified in Chapter 10 of this report.</p>	<p>As Recommendation 115. It is very noticeable that unlike other pay review bodies Winsor recommends an ex senior officers should be part of the pay review body but excludes any involvement of any person to represent the views of all ranks.</p>