

CHAPTER 9

COMMENTS ON THE DISCIPLINED SERVICES

9.1 In Chapter IX of their report, the Consultants compared the base salary of the Disciplined Services with that of the Master Pay Scale.

9.2 Members of the Committee made the following comments :

9.2.1 Police Force Council

The Commissioner of Police wrote in a letter on 2 January 1987 as follows :

" In my letter of the 28 November 1986, I advised that the Staff Side of the Police Force Council would not attend further meetings of the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee and I also indicated that the views of the four Police Staff Associations would be submitted to me in writing and relayed to the Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service.

Their views have now been received and are summarized as follows :

' The aim of the survey was to assess whether the remuneration of civil servants was broadly in line with that of employees in the private sector undertaking comparable work. At best therefore the survey can be but a generalisation. Given the large number of jobs in the civil service, it is doubted that such a survey can produce a meaningful indicator of salary level unless compared job for job with the private sector.

Here arises another anomaly in the sense that no access is given to private sector remuneration packages by the PLSAC and whilst civil service practice is open and public, this cannot be said for the private sector. It is

contended that unless the private sector is prepared to allow full verification of data, the survey will not be acceptable.

No evidence is adduced in the survey as to which jobs were considered comparable with the range of work undertaken by Police Officers. Chapter IX of the report gives no indication of this. The Police Force Council would wish to know how the comparison was undertaken and would wish to see a Base Salary Graph for the Police Force compared with :

- (a) the other disciplined services;  
and
- (b) Government staff on the Master Pay Scale.

In earlier meetings of the PLSAC the Staff Side of the Police Force Council accepted the Hay methodology and were at considerable pains to stress the nature of Police work, the constraints under which officers work and other matters which it was felt made the police service unique and which have been accepted in the United Kingdom as valid in deciding upon levels of pay. The Force itself, in selecting officers for interview, was scrupulously fair in ensuring that the spread of posts selected represented a fair picture.

None of this appears to have been taken into account and it is understood that the nature of the job was not a consideration in which case the relevance of the survey to the Police Force cannot be understood. If nature of work did not figure in the equation then the result is incomplete at best and distorted at worst.

More details are requested of the "closest analogues" used to provide representation as stated in page 9 of Chapter III of the survey report.

The hours of work for the Police Force as set out in Annex J of the Report appear to be misleading. There is no indication how the figure of 46 hours per week, net, for all ranks has been reached. The conditioned hours for Uniform Branch officers are 51 hours per week (i.e. 6 x 8 hours + 6 x  $\frac{1}{2}$  hours for parade).

The Report appears to be based upon an over-generalisation and is not an accurate representation. There are many jobs in the private sector which have civil service analogues yet none appears to have been taken into account in other than general terms. If the Consultants are unable or unwilling to compare specific posts in the private sector with specific posts in Government, then the validity of such a survey must be questioned when considering posts for which there is no private sector analogue.

Unless matters such as nature of work are included in job size then the results of the survey cannot be considered further or accepted as having a relevance to police service.'

I have no further comments to add."

9.2.2 The Chairman has replied to the above letter as follows :

" Thank you for your letter of 2 January 1987, in which you have summarized the reasons given by the four Police Staff Associations for their absence from meetings of the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee. In the following paragraphs, I shall give my views on the specific points raised in your letter.

1. Whether the Pay Level Survey is Meaningful

I agree with you that the Pay Level Survey is a generalisation and it could not be otherwise (see paragraph 3 below). The main objective of the survey is to establish a broad comparison of pay and

benefits between the public and private sectors. This has been made clear in paragraph 1.14 of Report No. 16 of the Standing Commission, in which it went so far as to state that "pay level surveys should not be regarded as structural reviews of the civil service, nor used to alter the present broadbanding system or internal relativities of the civil service". As to your doubt on whether such a survey can be meaningful, given the large number of jobs in the civil service, the Consultants have advised that the sample used in the survey, which represents approximately 15% of civil service ranks, is more than adequate to give a statistically acceptable result, on which to judge whether public and private sector total packages are broadly comparable.

2. Access to Information Concerning Private Sector Companies

As has been pointed out at Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee meetings on several occasions, it is not possible to disclose details of individual private company total packages, since the companies participating in the survey were assured that their data would be treated in strict confidence before the survey began and, indeed, many agreed to take part only on the basis of this proviso. Members of the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee were informed of this from the start, and the Consultants have advised that this decision must stand if their reputation as professional consultants in the eyes of these companies is not to be compromised. However, at the request of some members of the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee, the Consultants have made arrangement to release the computer print-outs of the data on the utilization of fringe benefits in the private sector for members' examination. In case you are also interested in examining such information, similar arrangement could be made with the Consultants.

3. Job Comparison

Your request for a comparison of the base salaries of police officers and officers in the other Disciplined Services, I am afraid, falls outside the scope of this survey and cannot, therefore, be acceded to. As I have explained above, the Pay Level Survey is not designed to study internal relativities in the civil service and it would be inappropriate to use its results for such a purpose. However, a comparison of police force base salaries with the base salaries of civil servants on the Master Pay Scale, at the median job size, is given in the revised version of the Consultants' report at Chart 19. This is provided in accordance with the methodology outlined in Chapter 7 of the Standing Commission's Report No. 16.

Your comment that no information is provided in the survey on which jobs were considered comparable with jobs in the Police Force, however, shows a misconception of the methodology for the survey, which was fully discussed at earlier meetings of the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee, attended by your three Staff Side representatives of the Police Force Council. The Standing Commission has long recognized the fact that there are insufficient acceptable outside analogues for many civil service jobs to make meaningful comparison, the work of the Disciplined Services being a prime example. For this reason, the survey does not attempt to compare particular jobs in the civil service with similar jobs in the private sector, but uses the method of factorial analysis recommended by the Hay Management Consultants to establish the relative sizes of all the jobs surveyed, whereby jobs of the same size (which may not necessarily be similar in content or function) in the two sectors can then be compared in terms of basic pay and total packages. This method, which has been used with success in similar surveys in other parts of the world, is considered the most viable means of overcoming this

problem. It is unfortunate that most of the comments and criticisms in your letter stem from the misconception referred to above, and a lack of appreciation of the basic principles behind the methodology.

With reference to your request for further details of the "closest analogues" mentioned in Chapter III of the Consultants' report, the Consultants have confirmed that the list of jobs included in Annex D of their report is by no means exhaustive. It is merely intended to give a reasonable indication of the types of jobs surveyed within each family. In some instances, the title of a job may differ from those included in the list or the functions of two jobs in one family may be combined to form a single job and it is such cases that the reference to "closest analogues" is intended to cover. (For example, a security guard may, instead, be called a night watchman and the jobs of telephonist and receptionist may be performed by one individual).

4. Special Nature of Disciplined Services Jobs

You are correct in saying that the Consultants' methodology does not take into account the special nature of the duties of the Disciplined Services, such as the inherent danger of the work and the restrictions placed on members of these services; but, as stated in paragraph 7.1.1 (iii) of the Standing Commission's Report No. 16, the Consultants were to obtain information from the private sector companies on the way in which their employees are compensated for special factors and use this data to comment on the element paid to the Disciplined Services in recognition of the special factors pertaining to their work. In the event, the Consultants have prepared a new chapter to replace the original Chapter 9 in their report, in which they try to provide more information pertaining to the special nature of disciplinary

service jobs. For ease of reference, a copy of the new chapter is attached. In case you are still not satisfied, please let me know and I will reflect your views to the Standing Commission.

One point concerns the net weekly hours of work : you point out in your letter that the conditioned weekly working hours of all Police Force members, up to and including Senior Superintendents in the upper/upper pay band, amount to 51; whereas the figures used by the Consultants are based on gross figures supplied by the Administration. In order to maintain consistency with the approach used for all other civil service ranks in the survey, the Consultants have had to make an assumption regarding the reduction in hours which should be applied to take account of meal breaks. They have therefore assumed that meal breaks will cover a total of five hours per week and a subtraction of this figure from the conditioned hours of 51 has produced the net figure of 46 hours per week. However, your observation has been duly noted and will be drawn to the attention of the Standing Commission.

With your agreement, the points raised in your letter will be incorporated in the Second Report of the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee as the comments rendered by the Police Force Council."