

# WINSOR II RECOMMENDATIONS AND 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

<b>Recommendation 1</b> -The terms and conditions of police officers and staff should remain separate for the foreseeable future.	No immediate impact on Federated ranks but one to watch for the future. Any harmonisation of Terms and Conditions is likely to be to the detriment of police officers, rather than increases for police staff.
<b>Recommendation 2</b> -The new police pay review body (see Chapter 10) should undertake a periodic review of the development of the police workforce, and its increasing professionalisation and specialisation, and make an assessment and recommendation to the Home Secretary as to the feasibility of attaining a greater degree of harmonisation of the terms and conditions of police officers and those of police staff. Where it is feasible, it should be done. The period in question should be five years.	Insufficient information to form a detailed opinion. If policing is to become more specialised and professional then it is not unreasonable to think that there should be a greater gap between police officers pay and police staff pay.
<b>Recommendation 3</b> - From April 2013, an additional qualification should be added to the list	This could have a significant impact on the possibility of achieving a more

<p>required for appointment to a police force in Regulation 10 of the Police Regulations 2003. Candidates eligible for appointment to a police force should have either a Level 3 qualification, or a police qualification which is recognised by the sector skills council, Skills for Justice, or service as a special constable or service as a pcso (or another staff role which the chief officer is satisfied provides appropriate experience). The chief officer should have a discretion in relation to which of these criteria should apply to applicants for entry to his force.</p>	<p>diverse workforce.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4</b> - Forces should collaborate on the development of policing qualifications.</p>	<p>Insufficient information to form an opinion.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 5</b> -The pass mark for the 2013 SEARCH assessment process should be raised to at least 70%. This should be reviewed after five years to ensure that the academic threshold is sufficiently rigorous.</p>	<p>A move to increase academic standards is understandable but must be inclusive for all.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 6</b> - The basic training of police officers should be improved so as more fully to cover the essential features of the place of the police in the criminal justice system.</p>	<p>The Police Federation has always urged that officers deserve to be better trained.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 7</b> - The police service should establish a programme of intensive promotion of itself, and all the advantages it has to offer, to young people in schools and universities throughout the country.</p>	<p>The Federation support any attempt to improve the image of policing and attract the best possible recruits</p>
<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 rarified concepts of what it might be like.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 9</b> - The Direct Entry (Inspector) scheme should last three years for</p>	<p>Experience proves that most accelerated promotion initiatives end up</p>

<p>external candidates and two years for internal candidates. Successful candidates should attain the rank of inspector at the end of the scheme. In the first year, external candidates should gain policing experience, and by the end of that year pass an intensive version of the diploma in policing. At the end of this year, participants who have met the requisite standard of achievement should be promoted to sergeant and begin a two-year course where they will be joined by in-service candidates who have also been promoted to sergeant. This course should have a residential element based at the national police college, and time spent in force. The course should focus on leadership, operational policing and management skills. Assessment should be rigorous and continuous. There should be two examinations a year which must be passed. Successful participants should be promoted to inspector on completion of the course.</p>	<p>with candidates working on “projects” this does not provide operational experience. Whilst rigorous assessment and examinations are welcome there appears insufficient requirement to be able to deliver operational policing.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 10</b> - Paragraph I of Determination Annex C, made under Regulation 12 of the Police Regulations 2003, should be amended to allow those on an accelerated promotion scheme recognised by the Home Secretary to serve a one-year probationary period, or shorter as the relevant chief officer determines in the circumstances of a particular case.</p>	<p>If Recommendations 8 and 9 are accepted then this is merely an instrument to facilitate that.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 11</b> - Regulation 7(2) of the Police (Promotion) Regulations 1996 should be amended to provide that officers on an accelerated promotion scheme, recognised by the Home Secretary, should be promoted from constable to sergeant if they have met the criteria to join a recognised accelerated promotion scheme course, have completed one year's service and have passed a one year probation period, subject to the discretion of their Chief Constable. Officers promoted in such a manner should be on probation until they have completed two years' service at that rank or a recognised accelerated promotion scheme course, whichever is later.</p>	<p>Again it merely seems to be the instrument to allow such a scheme to come into being.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 12</b> - Regulation 7(4) of the Police (Promotion) Regulations 1996 should be amended to provide that officers on an accelerated promotion scheme recognised by the</p>	<p>Another instrument.</p>

<p>Home Secretary should automatically be promoted from sergeant to inspector upon passing a recognised accelerated promotion course.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 13</b> - The Police Professional Body should develop a distance-learning version of the policing technical certificate designed as a pre-entry requirement for the Direct Entry (Inspector) scheme and Direct Entry (Superintendent) scheme, or work with an appropriate education provider to do so.</p>	<p>Distance learning is a poor replacement for operational policing experience but as this seems to be aimed at learning before joining the service, it is hoped that a realistic amount of time spent in Operational policing could fill in the gaps.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 14</b> - The Police Professional Body should lengthen the current 'Foundation for Senior Leaders' course so that those taking it learn about leadership, management and operational skills in greater depth. The course should last six weeks instead of three weeks.</p>	<p>Any improvement in training is welcome.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 15</b> - Officers wishing to become eligible for promotion to superintendent should first be required successfully to complete an enhanced 'Foundation for Senior Leaders Course'.</p>	<p>Insufficient information to pass judgement but it appears to reverse the logical promotion process by put training before selection, with the risk that much of this training could be wasted if applicants are not successful.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 16</b> - Provision should be made in police regulations to enable police officers to be seconded to organisations outside policing for a period not exceeding five years.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that spending up to 5 years working elsewhere would make anyone a better police officer. However it is desirable to have officers with a wide breadth of knowledge and experience.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 17</b> - The Police Regulations 2003 should be amended to provide for the return to the police service of former non-probationary officers at the rank they last held. There should be no right of return and there must be a suitable vacancy. Return after more than five years should not be allowed other than in exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>It appears to be a reasonable concept given that a degree of re-training may be necessary and may be substantial. However it appears unlikely that individuals will take this option if there is no guarantee they can get back into the police service.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 18</b> - The Police Regulations 2003 should be amended to provide that returning officers should be subject to a probationary period of six months.</p>	<p>It is not clear why this is necessary. Officers who have been selected for this scheme, would have already shown their abilities and commitment. Again it is hardly likely to make the scheme attractive.</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 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.</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> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 20</b> - 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.</p>	<p>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>
<p><b>Recommendation 21</b> - Determination Annex C of Regulation 12 of the Police Regulations 2003 should be amended to provide that those entering above the rank of constable should serve a probationary period in accordance with the applicable direct entry scheme.</p>	<p>Another instrument to allow for such a scheme.</p>

<b>Recommendation 22</b> - The direct entry scheme for superintendents should be reviewed after a period of five years.	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.
<b>Recommendation 23</b> - From September 2013, the eligible experience for a Chief Constable set out in Determination Annex B, made under Regulation 11 of the Police Regulations 2003, should be amended to include service in a chief officer equivalent role overseas in a common law jurisdiction which practises policing by consent.	Policing in other countries is different to British policing. A system of engagement with other police services could be desirable but the necessity for such liaison to involve direct entry at senior level isn't clear.
<b>Recommendation 24</b> - The eligible experience for a Chief Constable set out in Schedule 8, Part 1, paragraph 2(1)(a) of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 should be amended to include service in a chief officer equivalent role overseas in a common law jurisdiction which practises policing by consent.	As Recommendation 23.
<b>Recommendation 25</b> - The Police Professional Body should develop a flexible, tailored course of instruction for Chief Constables appointed from overseas.	If we have to them some training would be required!!
<b>Recommendation 26</b> - Determination Annex B, made under Regulation 11 of the Police Regulations 2003, should be amended to remove the requirement as to the length or place of service required to become a Chief Constable in the case only of officers to be appointed as Chief Constables from police forces outside the United Kingdom.	An instrument to allow the scheme to be introduced.
<b>Recommendation 27</b> - The sole criterion for the recruitment, advancement and promotion of police officers should be merit.	Complete agreement.
<b>Recommendation 28</b> - All police forces should establish efficient methods for the active and constructive development of the careers of officers, irrespective of rank. The best candidates should be sought out and their potential developed and realised.	Complete agreement.

<p><b>Recommendation 29</b> - Each force should establish a succession planning system which identifies projected vacancies and the people most likely to be best fitted to fill them, bearing in mind the long-term as well as the short-term needs of the individual, the force and the police service as a whole.</p>	<p>Whilst it may be desirable, it may well create such a bureaucracy as to outweigh any benefits.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 30</b> - Chief Constables should make greater use of 'rank skipping', so that an officer is not required to serve at every rank in his career if he is considered ready for promotion to a rank higher than the next.</p>	<p>Insufficient detail to comment and could be greatly abused. Who is to decide that someone is ready to be promoted and to skip a rank. Appears to be wide open to nepotism and allegations of discrimination.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 31</b> - For each rank above constable, a core set of leadership, management and financing skills should be established by the new Police Professional Body. An officer should be trained and assessed in these before he is promoted.</p>	<p>The need for every officer above Constable to be trained in finance appears a little strange, but training managers how to manage and lead may be beneficial</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 32</b> - The responsibilities of the Police Promotions Examination Board for setting promotions standards should be subsumed into the Police Advisory Board of England and Wales so that recommendations on the standards required for entry and promotion are considered by the same body. When this has been done, the PPEB should be abolished.</p>	<p>Appears to be sensible.</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 35</b> - From September 2018, the national police recruitment test should be replaced by the more demanding physical assessment test used in the Police Service of Northern Ireland.</p>	<p>May have Equality issues.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 36</b> - From September 2018, probationers should have to prove their fitness against the more demanding physical assessment test of the Police Service of Northern Ireland.</p>	<p>Appears to be a provision to dispense with services of Probationer's under Regulation 13 if they fail fitness test.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 37</b> - From September 2018, national fitness tests for specialist police officer roles should be introduced, designed most closely to test the physical capability of officers to discharge the responsibilities of the specialist police officers in the field.</p>	<p>Many specialist officers already undergo fitness testing.</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 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</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 retire. Where the disability is not permanent officers should be given every opportunity to achieve operational deployability.</p>

<p>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><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 42</b> - The Police Act 1996 should be amended to give the Police Appeals Tribunal the same power as an employment tribunal in respect of the remedies it may order when it has found in favour of a claimant police officer.</p>	<p>Police Appeals Tribunals should be able to insist the force re-employs an officer.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 43</b> - The normal pension age for police officers should be set at 60 in line with the implemented recommendations made by Lord Hutton of Furness.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 44</b> - A future police pension scheme should retain the existing test which must be fulfilled for an officer to be considered for an ill-health retirement pension, that is that the officer should be permanently disabled for the ordinary duties of a police officer.</p>	<p>Maintains the status quo.</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 48</b> - Officers who have been subject to compulsory severance should have access to employment tribunals if they wish to allege that their severance has been unfair.</p>	<p>If there has to be redundancy (and we don't accept that) then it is only fair that police officers are treated as other employees and have a right of redress.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 49</b> - HMIC, in consultation with police forces, the Police Professional Body and the Home Office, should establish a national template for a force management statement which should be published by each police force with its annual report. The force management statement should contain consistently presented, reliable data about the projected demands on the force in the short, medium and long terms, the force's plans for meeting those demands, including its financial plans, and the steps it intends to take to improve the efficiency and</p>	<p>More bureaucracy, more targets.</p>

<p>economy with which it will maintain and develop its workforce and other assets, and discharge its obligations to the public. Each force management statement should also contain a report, with reasons, on the force's performance in the last year against the projections made for that year in the last force management statement. Exclusions should be permitted on security grounds.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 50</b> - Compensation payments for Chief Constables and Deputy Chief Constables whose fixed term appointments are not renewed should be fair and more generous than the compensation available to officers who leave the police service by reason of compulsory severance, taking into account any pension entitlements. The current scheme should therefore remain.</p>	<p>Any severance package for police officers should be the same for all. A two tier system is elitist and unfair. If we are to be treated as professionals, then that approach must be consistent and be judged as convenient to some proposals but not others.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 51</b> - Hearings under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2008, which have the power to dismiss an officer, should also have the power to remove some or all of the compensation payment for the contract of appointment to which the chief officer is currently subject if there has been a violation of the mandatory standards of professional conduct under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2008.</p>	<p>Refers to Chief Officers only.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 52</b> - Fixed term appointments for Chief Constables and Deputy Chief Constables should remain in place.</p>	<p>Not a matter for the Police Federation.</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>

<b>Recommendation 55</b> - Pay points 6, 7, and 9 should be removed from the existing constables' pay scale in April 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively. This will allow constables to move to the maximum more quickly and ensure that the current and new pay scales merge in 2016.	The Federation has always supported shortening of the pay scales.
<b>Recommendation 56</b> - Pay point 0 of the current sergeants' pay scale should be removed from April 2014 to ensure that sergeants are always paid more than constables, consistent with the greater responsibilities of the job.	Accepted.
<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.	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.
<b>Recommendation 58</b> - The police pay review body should, in its first triennial review, consider further increasing the gap between the constable and sergeant pay scales, and between the inspector and chief inspector pay scales, to ensure that good candidates are incentivised to seek promotion.	Such a move to widen differentials may be appropriate as long as it is implemented by augmenting pay for Sergeants and Chief Inspectors and not to the detriment of Constables and Inspectors.
<b>Recommendation 59</b> - The national spend on bonuses and double increments for superintendents should be reinvested into a revised three-point pay scale for superintendents, with a starting salary of £60,094 and a maximum of £72,585 from April 2014.	Does not affect Federated members.
<b>Recommendation 60</b> - The post-related allowance for chief superintendents should be abolished. The cost of the post-related allowance, bonus payments and double increments, should be reinvested into a revised basic pay scale for chief superintendents with a starting salary of £77,215 and a maximum of £81,457 from April 2014.	Does not affect Federated ranks.

<p><b>Recommendation 61</b> - Assistant Chief Constables should remain on a single national pay scale.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 62</b> - The pay scale for Assistant Chief Constables should be replaced with a three-point pay scale. It should start at £93,753 have a second pay point at £99,798 and a maximum of £105,849. Existing pay points 1,3 and 5 should be removed in April 2014, 2015 and 2016 respectively.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 63</b> - The pay of Deputy Chief Constables should remain unchanged in the short-term.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 64</b> - Police and crime commissioners should have the power to set the Chief Constable's basic pay at any level which is up to ten <i>per cent</i> above or below the national rate for a Chief Constable in the force in question.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 65</b> - Each police and crime commissioner should publish in his annual report the rate of basic pay agreed with the Chief Constable, and the reasons why it was set at that level, together with the details and value of all benefits received by chief officers.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 66</b> - All police forces should review, and if necessary amend, their pay grading structures to ensure that they are fully compliant with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010.</p>	<p>We agree.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 67</b> - Police forces should review pay grading structures at the earliest opportunity and in any case not later than April 2013. Where they establish that pay scales are excessively long, they should be shortened as fairly and quickly as possible, consistently with the need for efficiency and economy.</p>	<p>We agree.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 68</b> - Police staff pay grading should continue to be undertaken by individual police forces.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 69</b> - Police forces should review and, if necessary, amend their pay grading systems in relation to local pay rates to ensure that they are paying no more than is required to recruit and retain individuals of the requisite quality. Any necessary adjustments to grading systems should be made with sensitivity to the personal financial circumstances of the police staff affected, who should be provided with an appropriate degree of pay protection as any necessary changes are brought into effect over time.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 70</b> - Forces should undertake this review as part of their normal salary determination processes. The review should begin no later than April 2013.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 71</b> - The deployment component of the police officer X-factor should be established to be 8% of basic pay for constables. For other ranks, it should be expressed in cash terms, benchmarked at 8% of the maximum of constables' basic pay.</p>	<p>Whilst it may be helpful to have the X-factor defined, this appears to be merely an instrument to devise a sum of money that can be docked from officers' pay.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 72</b> - The value of the deployment component of the X-factor should be reviewed every five years. The new police pay review body, recommended in Chapter 10, should conduct the review.</p>	<p>If the Pay Review Body meets every 3 years then surely all reviews should occur triennially.</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>

<b>Recommendation 75</b> - Forces that recruit constables in the first five years of their service should pay compensation to the force from which they have recruited the constable, to ensure that training costs are fairly shared amongst all forces.	Understandable, but does not directly affect Federated ranks although were it to lead to the creation of a barrier to officers wishing to transfer between forces, it could cause problems
<b>Recommendation 76</b> - The new police pay review body should consider the case for the extension of a system to reimburse the training costs of specialist police officer roles, such as firearms, in its first triennial review.	As Recommendation 75.
<b>Recommendation 77</b> - Police staff pay grading should continue to be determined at force level.	Does not affect Federated ranks.
<b>Recommendation 78</b> - Police forces should examine how their police staff salaries relate to the local labour market, and adjust them If they are found to be paying rates that are above or below the level necessary to recruit and retain individuals of the right calibre.	Does not affect Federated ranks.
<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.	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.
<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)	See Recommendation 79.

<p>minimising bureaucracy; and (b) working on the assumption of competence.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 81</b> - The amended NPIA 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 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>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><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 85</b> - ACPO, and the Police Federation and police staff trade unions, along with other interested parties, should establish a series of new national policing awards for police officers and staff.</p>	<p>This is window dressing. Were such a scheme introduced it must be crystal clear that it would not be acceptable for Police federation members subscriptions being used in any way to support such awards.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 86</b> - Pay progression for officers in the superintending and ACC ranks should be subject to at least a satisfactory box marking in the annual appraisal. Those officers whose contribution is marked as satisfactory 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.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 87</b> - Double increment pay progression should be abolished in April 2013.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 88</b> - Individual bonus schemes for officers in the superintending, ACC and DCC ranks should be abolished in April 2013.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 89</b> -The bonus scheme for Chief Constables should be abolished with effect from April 2013.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 90</b> - Contribution-related pay progression should be extended so as to apply to all police staff.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 91</b> - Performance-related bonus schemes for police staff, of all grades, should be abolished with effect from April 2013.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 92</b> - Chief officer bonuses which are awarded to police officers for performing outstandingly demanding, unpleasant, or important work should be maintained, and police staff in all forces should be eligible to receive these payments on the same terms as officers.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 93</b> - The present implementation of the Policing Professional Framework (PPF) for police staff roles should continue.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 94</b> - An interim Expertise and Professional Accreditation Allowance (EPAA) should be introduced from April 2013. It should reward qualifying officers for the skills they use in the four stated priority functions: neighbourhood policing; public order; investigation; and firearms. The EPAA should be £600 <i>per annum</i>, and should be paid monthly. It should be removed when an officer leaves the qualifying role. The EPAA should be abolished when the Specialist Skills Threshold is introduced.</p>	<p>In Winsor I this recommendation suggested a payment of £1200 per annum. The rationale for a lesser payment seems to be that the Police Arbitration Tribunal and the Home Secretary didn't support some of the recommendations in Winsor I. If £1200 is the rate for the job then that is what should be recommended. Given the extraordinarily high demands placed on Level 2 Public Order officers £600 is unlikely to prove sufficient to attract volunteers. The possible risk of injury is greater with the increased possibility of future reductions in pay via Recommendation 39.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 95</b> - A Foundation Skills Threshold should be introduced at the fourth point of the constables' pay scale by 2016 at the latest. It should test the officer's knowledge and understanding of the fundamentals and essential details of the criminal law, including the rules of evidence and procedure, the constitutional position of the police, including their accountability, and the rights of witnesses, victims and suspects, and other citizens. The Police Professional Body should be remitted to devise the test.</p>	<p>Another level of bureaucracy. There is little or no provision for any in house training. There is no explanation as to how officers working 12 hours shifts will find time to keep fit and study for such exams in their own time.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 96</b> - Every constable should attempt the Foundation Skills Threshold, and only those who pass the test should be allowed to move up the pay scale. Constables should be re-tested every five years. Repeated failures to pass the test should lead to the constable being entered into the force's unsatisfactory performance procedures.</p>	<p>As Recommendation 95.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 97</b> - A Specialist Skills Threshold should be introduced at the final pay point of all police officer pay scales up to and including chief superintendent, by 2016 at the latest. It should consist of a rigorous test of the specialist knowledge and skills required in each</p>	<p>As Recommendation 95.</p>

<p>role and rank. The Police Professional Body should be remitted to devise the test.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 98</b> - Officers who pass the Specialist Skills Threshold test should move up to the pay maximum for their rank, and receive an accredited qualification. The test should be re-taken every three years. Failure to pass the re-test should result in the officer reverting to the highest non-threshold pay point.</p>	<p>As Recommendation 95.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 99</b> - The Specialist Skills Threshold should apply only to those roles that require the warranted powers or expertise of a police officer. A suggested list for the Federated ranks is provided in Table 9.6. The Police Professional Body should be remitted to determine which roles are eligible for the Specialist Skills Threshold. When established, the prescribed skill areas should be determined by the police pay review body with the advice of the Police Professional Body, which should accredit them and set the standards to be attained.</p>	<p>This appears to be Specialist Priority Payments by another name. If the Police Professional Body are to be allowed to influence the pay review body then where is the balance of any Federated rank input?</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 100</b> - A Specialist Skills Threshold should be introduced at the final pay point of police staff pay scales, and should operate in the same way as for police officers. It should be for police forces to determine which of their police staff roles are eligible for the Specialist Skills Threshold, using implementation of the Policing Professional Framework and Authorised Professional Practice as the basis for establishing which roles require specialist skills.</p>	<p>Does not appear to affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 101</b> - A Public Order Allowance (POA) should be established when the EPAA is removed. It should be paid to those officers who have attained Level 1 or 2 public order accreditation and who have been deployed to at least six public order operations during a 12-month period in which the 'Gold, Silver, Bronze' Command Structure was activated. The POA should be £600 <i>per annum</i>.</p>	<p>If such an allowance is to be paid it should be paid to all officers who volunteer for, and pass the training and thereby make themselves available for such deployments. It is hard to imagine many officers in the MPS not achieving the number of 6 deployments. As stated the threat of Recommendation 39 is so high that this payment is unlikely to be successful in attracting volunteers.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 102</b> - The continued eligibility of the qualifying group of public order officers to receive the Public Order Allowance should be considered every five years by the new police pay review body. The police pay review body should consider whether, and by how much, it should be updated each year.</p>	<p>The payment should be reviewed yearly to allow Chief Officers to react to rise and falls in numbers of officers volunteering for Public Order roles.</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 royalty protection officers, and which takes appropriate account of the unique requirements of specialist protection officers.</p>	<p>As Recommendation 103.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 105</b> - In 2017, the recommended police officer pay review body should reconsider the buy-out of sergeants' casual overtime.</p>	<p>Insufficient detail to comment at this time.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 106</b> - Annual Data Returns from forces should include separate breakdowns of overtime hours worked, and total overtime spend for constables and sergeants.</p>	<p>No objection unless it proves bureaucratic.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 107</b> - The Police Staff Council's Handbook, Section 1, paragraph 6.1.2 should be amended to provide for the payment of additional hours of Sunday working at the rate of plain time. This should be agreed with the Police Staff Council and incorporated into contracts of employment. In the case of police forces outside the PSC arrangements, these changes should be agreed in the usual manner with the relevant unions.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 108</b> - For working public holidays, police staff should receive double time for 25 December and seven other days chosen by the individual before 31 January for the next financial year. Managers should have the right to refuse requests if a date proves too popular and force resilience becomes questionable. Cancellation with fewer than 15 days' notice should require the authorisation of an Assistant Chief Constable.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 109</b> - Changes to police staff overtime payments should take effect from April 2016, in conjunction with recommendations 107 and 108 relating to the payment of police staff unsocial hours. The Police Staff Council and other negotiating forums should spend the period before implementation determining how to mitigate any undue detrimental effects that changes to overtime payments may have on some police staff.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 110</b> - The definition of unsocial hours for police officers and staff should be harmonised. For both officers and staff: it should be defined as work which takes place between the hours of 8:00pm and 6:00am, with all days of the week being of equal weight.</p>	<p>Appears sensible, but it is not for us to comment about police staff arrangements.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 111</b> - By April 2016, Section 1, Subsection 8 of the Police Staff Council Handbook should be replaced with a provision for the payment of police staff at the rate of 100% uplift in pay (double time) for each unsocial hour worked. The PSC should conduct further research to ensure this recommendation is affordable.</p>	<p>Does not appear to apply to Federated ranks, but if Winsor wants harmonisation between police officer pay and police staff pay this could become a factor in the future.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 112</b> - A national on-call allowance for the Federated ranks should be introduced from April 2013. The amount of the allowance should be £15 for each daily occasion of on-call after the officer in question has undertaken 12 on-call sessions in the year beginning on 1 April.</p>	<p>This payment is very low when considered against the disruption to home/family life that such duties incur., There can be no justification for the 12 session qualifying period. Officers who volunteer to place themselves on-call save the service money and time and deserve to have this disruption to their home life compensated.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 113</b> - The national on-call allowance should be reviewed by the new police pay review body in its first triennial review when better management data are available.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 114</b> - Forces should compile clear management data on the voluntary deployment of officers on-call.</p>	<p>Completely agree.</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>
<p><b>Recommendation 117</b> - Once the police pay review body has been established, police pensions should be handled by the Police Advisory Boards of England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.</p>	<p>This may be an appropriate course of action but more information is needed.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 118</b> - The Senior Salaries Review Body should take responsibility for setting the pay of Chief Constables, Deputy Chief Constables and Assistant Chief Constables by 2014.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 119</b> - The Police Staff Council should receive approximately £50,000 per annum from police forces to fund regular data surveys of the remuneration and conditions of police staff.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 120</b> - All police forces should negotiate a strike resolution procedure for police staff which is similar to that used by Surrey Police.</p>	<p>Does not affect Federated ranks at present.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 121</b> - The chair of the PABEW should ensure issues for its consideration are discussed with greater despatch and efficiency, and that as far as reasonably practicable they are disposed of within six months of being raised.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
--	---------------