

History of Police Office Pay Framework

The following Act/Committee are listed out in this report:

- The Municipal Corporations Act 1835
- County Police Act 1839
- The Desborough Committee 1920
- The Police Act 1919
- The Committee on National Expenditure 1922
- The Desborough report of 1924
- The Lee Committee 1925
- The May Committee on National Expenditure 1931
- The Higgins Committee on pay for new entrants 1933
- The Oaksey Committee 1949
- Sir Malcolm Trustram Eve KC (report in 1951)
- The Royal Commission 1960
- The Edmund-Davies Committee 1978
- The Sheehy report 1993
- White Paper Policing A New Century: A Blueprint for Reform
- 2002 PNB agreement on police pay and conditions
- Winsor Review 2011/12

Pay for Federated Officers – timeline of key events				
Driver/Reason	Act/Committee	Key points/outcomes	Guiding principles/ pay reference points	Comment
The Metropolitan Police was established in London in 1829		The pay of police officers was for many years set at a rate comparable to that of an unskilled agricultural labourer.	It was a deliberate policy to recruit men “ who had not the rank, habits or station of a gentleman ”.	
	The Municipal Corporations Act 1835	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compelled cities and boroughs to establish police forces in their areas. • Did not determine police pay, leaving boroughs free to set rates at whatever levels they saw fit. • In practice, borough forces generally set pay at the rates used in the county forces. 		
	County Police Act 1839	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gave the Secretary of State the power to set pay rates for all county forces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided seven different pay scales for constables, six for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet 3 early form of performance related pay and

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rules establishing parameters for constables' pay in all county forces • Pay rates for county forces were periodically revised 	<p>sergeants and three for inspectors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County forces were able to select "one or other of them, according to local circumstances" • Recruits started as <u>3rd class constables</u> and were promoted <u>to the 2nd and 1st classes on merit.</u> This was the only way they could reach top of scale. • Home Office confirmed, "<i>a generally recognised principle that a county constable should be paid at a somewhat higher rate than the agricultural labourer in his county</i>" 	<p>fits with principles of ARC!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay rates were butt-ended, with sergeants on appointment being paid more than constables at their maximum.
--	--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference on how inspectors pay was gauged. It was about 3x that of a sergeant. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% + inflation post WW1. Police pay had not kept up with the increase, leading to a significant drop in the standard of living of police officers disparities in pay between forces lack of central direction was leading to inter-authority pay competition Home Office to take responsibility for police pay and to introduce a new Exchequer Grant to cover half the cost of the police. This was agreed 	The Desborough Committee 1920	<p>The Desborough Committee's report, and the Police Act 1919 that enacted its recommendations, fundamentally changed police pay and set it on a footing that is still recognisable today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single pay scale fixed for all forces, whilst pensions, housing and other conditions should be assimilated across the country Pay for constables substantially increased. 13 increments covering 22 years of service. Additional long service increments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desborough considered policing to be unique. Desborough argued that <u>the nature of police work and the responsibilities of the police officer made redundant the labour market comparison with agricultural workers or unskilled labourers</u> which had informed police pay decisions in the 19th century 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Later increments on pay scales seen as a retention aid. <u>No identified reference point used to determine recommended pay</u> (other than cost of living rising by 105 %?).

<p>after police strike in 1918.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat of further strikes over pay. 		<p>were available at 17 and 22 years' service, subject to the constable's "good conduct and efficient service"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single standard scale for inspectors and chief inspectors in all forces not prescribed as not all roles standardised. Parameters set. • All ranks should either be provided with houses rent free, or a non-pensionable allowance in lieu". Since housing costs varied significantly - in effect, a form of local pay. 		
	The Police Act 1919	Gave effect to Desborough's central		

		recommendations, giving the Home Secretary the power, for the first time, to regulate police pay and conditions of service for all forces		
Large increase in Government expenditure post WW1, which had led to high levels of debt	The Committee on National Expenditure 1922	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended a series of economies, including a full investigation into the strength of all police forces, with the implication that numbers should be reduced. • Recommended that <i>“the obligation to pay the Metropolitan Police scale of remuneration in county and borough police forces should be cancelled”</i> • Home Sec not prepared to overturn 		Negative impact <u>on morale</u> a key factor in Home Sec’s decision.

		<p>Desborough's findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Savings made from a reduction in police numbers and temp deduction from pay and allowances 		
Continued fall in the cost of living since Desborough first reported in 1919, and the continued debate about police pay	The Desborough report of 1924	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A scale of pay for new entrants, and changes to pension entitlements • Concluded, "<i>It must be unsettling to any Service to have repeated revisions of their rates of pay</i>". • No changes to the pay scales that had been established in 1919. 	TOR's more focused on cost-saving measures.	No reference to market comparisons.
A growing divide in opinion between police authorities and the Police	The Lee Committee 1925	Pay and rent allowance deductions (introduced in 1922) should be		

Federation over the continuation of the pay and rent allowance deductions introduced in 1922		discontinued and converted into an increased pension contribution		
The Great Depression of 1929 led, in the United Kingdom, to high unemployment, falling prices and rising national expenditure.	The May Committee on National Expenditure 1931	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May noted that Desborough's increase in pay had been based on the fact that the cost of living had risen by 105% since the outbreak of the First World War. • Inflation had fallen "to 45% above pre-war. • Recommended new lower rate of pay for new entrants in their first three years of service. • Recommended a reduction of 12½ % pay reduction across all ranks over 2 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The task was to reduce national expenditure. • Wages in <u>outside industry</u> used as reference point 	Savings by headcount and negotiated salary reduction.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Home Secretary did not accept May’s recommendation on the pay reduction and, as with recommendations in 1922, made alternative arrangements to find the savings 		
When the lower rates of pay for new entrants were first proposed in 1931, the Home Secretary said that a committee would be appointed to investigate the matter in detail	The Higgins Committee on pay for new entrants 1933	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higgins echoed Desborough’s views about the unique requirements of policing that justify police officers’ relatively high pay, and argued that “the work and responsibilities of the police have further increased since 1919. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argued that because <i>“it is not until the fifth year that [a new entrant] can be said to be a fully equipped constable”</i>, Desborough had set the pay scale too high. • Argued that <u>public sector pay had to reflect changes in the private sector,</u> 	Throughout the interwar years, police pay remained high in relation to average incomes and the cost of living ¹ . During most of this period, the maximum of the constable’s pay scale was of the order of <u>55% higher than the earnings of the average adult male worker in industry</u>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also supported Desborough's intention to increase the standing of police work as a profession • Overall pay cut by 10% and parallel scale introduced alongside the Desborough scale for new recruits. 	<p>where there was downward pressure on wages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of living had fallen by approximately 30% since 1919, which meant that the police were overpaid when compared with workers elsewhere in the economy. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant rise in the cost of living during and after WW2. • Police pay had not kept up, meaning that police officers earned less in real terms after the war than they had done before it. • crisis of recruitment and retention 	The Oaksey Committee 1949	<p>Remit to review police pay and conditions 'in the light for the need for the recruitment and retention of an adequate number of suitable men and women' for the police service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended pay increases to improve the recruitment and retention of police officers. • 15% pay rise 	<p>Laid down principles for Government to consider in respect of pay:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The need for a strong and efficient police service. 2. The fact that the police service is undermanned, particularly in London and large cities. 3. The change in the nature of police duties and the environment in which they are performed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered the nature of policing, and found itself in agreement with Desborough's assessment of the responsibilities and obligations that are peculiar to the police • Also took account of factors that tended against rises in police pay (value of

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increment points reduced from 11 to 8. • Three long service increments were introduced in order to tackle retention problems. They were awarded after service of 10, 15, and 22 years. • Basic pay for inspectors and chief inspectors was set at a higher level in the Metropolitan Police • London weighting (then allowance) introduced. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Other occupations having received pay rises since the White Paper was published; 5. The likelihood that increased pay would help recruitment and retention 6. The need for all ranks to be treated the same 	concealed emoluments)
Pay demands increased throughout the 1950s	Sir Malcolm Trustram Eve KC (report in 1951)	20% pay increase and a further 9% increase in 1954.		Winsor identified no basis for the recommended increase – no doubt judgement based on inflation levels.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 1949 and 1959, average earnings in the 	The Royal Commission 1960	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remit was to consider again the structure and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rate for the job. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In making its recommendations on police pay, the

<p>economy had risen in real value by 35%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime reported to the police had increased by 45%, and crimes of violence had increased two and a half times². 		<p>levels of police pay and conditions of service, in the light of the persistence of problems in police recruitment and retention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New pay rate for constables that raised pay by up to 40%. • Two additional increments for long service Long service increments were re-instated as, <i>“an inducement to the constable to remain in the service, and as a feature of an improved career structure for the man who is not promoted”</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognising that policing, <i>“has a flavour all its own and comparisons with other services can be misleading”</i>; <p>This fair rate for the job was determined using a mathematical formula that took into account</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Minimum wages paid to skilled workers in 18 occupations</u> – skilled trades for which an apprenticeship is required. 2. Compensation for the constable for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - his inability to increase his pay in ways that were customary in other occupations; 	<p>Royal Commission considered the duties and responsibilities of constables, the need to attract and retain an adequate number of recruits with the proper qualifications, and the value of subsidiary emoluments such as pensions and housing allowances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>First review to introduce a formula.</u> • Point 3 looks like the police and military ‘X’ factor.
--	--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - his liability to work in shifts, at night, at week-ends, and on bank holidays without extra payment; - the fact that he is not permitted to undertake remunerative employment outside the police service; and - Unforeseeable and occasional overtime. <p>3. The drawbacks of police life:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exposure to danger - Subjection to discipline and a degree of social separation; - The constable's duties and responsibilities; - His way of life, his knowledge and professional skill - His physical and personal attributes. <p>4. A deduction to cover the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			provision of housing.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police pay had become uncompetitive, as the high levels of price inflation in the 1970s had reduced its value in real terms. • There had been net losses of police officers in Scotland in 1976 and in England and Wales in 1977 for the first time since 1960. 	The Edmund-Davies Committee 1978	<p>Original remit to review the police negotiating machinery but expanded to include police pay and asked “to consider the basis for determining police pay and the appropriate levels of remuneration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Found that police service had not lost ground to other workers since 1960 in terms of pay <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major revaluation of the services undertaken by the police • Pay scale that was 11 points long, and it would take 15 years of service to reach the maximum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee found that there was no precise formula for setting police pay based on comparisons with other workers: <i>“the only satisfactory way to proceed seems to us to be to review all the relevant factors and then make the best judgment we can”</i> • relevant factors used: • The changes to police work load and responsibilities and the role they are asked to fulfil. • The greater risk of injury faced by police officers. • The manpower problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seen as a major and long-lasting review • On pay comparability of police officer pay with that of other occupations. The committee concluded that it was impossible to compare the police with any other group of workers for pay purposes because <i>“the unique nature of the police service and the work they do makes this impossible</i> • Government of the day implemented 50% of Edmund-Davies’

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in constables' pay of between 30-45%. • unsocial hours consolidated into basic pay (9% uplift) • largest increases targeted at those constables at the upper end of the pay scale in order to retain experience (overlap with Sergeant scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of a right to strike. • Since the police <i>"cannot properly be compared to any other single group of workers"</i> comparison with the earnings of the whole community was favoured. • Police pay linked to the monthly <u>index of average earnings</u> of the New Earnings Survey index. 	<p>recommended pay rise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposition made a manifesto commitment to implement the rise in full, which it did following its election in 1979.
TOR's - "what changes, if any, would be sensible to ensure ... remuneration set and maintained at a level adequate to ensure the recruitment, retention, and motivation of officers of the right quality	The Sheehy report 1993	<p>Chaired by the industrialist Sir Patrick Sheehy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheehy reviewed the conclusions of the Edmund-Davies report and the principles that Edmund-Davies had used to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered that pay comparisons with other occupations were legitimate, believing that "it is possible to establish broad market. • Comparisons in respect of basic pay made with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very much a 'private sector' commercially focused and market led approach. • A radical departure from previous (and

		<p>determine police pay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered exaggerated tendency – to claim special status for police officers when this is not justified • Concluded constables and sergeants were overpaid compared to market – inspecting ranks just below market. • <u>no recruitment and retention problem to address</u> • Took an entirely new approach to determining police pay. • Sheehy recommended the introduction of a pay matrix job evaluation system 	<p>private sector only as they <i>“provide a more accurate reflection of the economic climate and the market than pay settlements in the public sector”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median of private sector pay in comparable occupations and roles to determine police rates. 	<p>subsequent reviews).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pay recommendations (amounting to a fundamental departure from the status quo) were not supported by Government (coincided with a change in political leadership). • <u>Free housing and rent allowance was removed</u> • <u>Rank reduction and overtime buy-out also supported.</u>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>(using four factors).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The pay scale for each rank to be benchmarked against the median of private sector pay in comparable occupations and roles.• No incremental pay increases (uplift only by performance)• Increasing workload should be managed through changes to job weights, responsibilities and establishment numbers instead.• Lower pay for new recruits based on private sector comparison.• Removal of free housing and rent allowance		
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overtime buy out for senior ranks • Removal of chief inspector, chief superintendent and DCC ranks. 		
Police reform 2002	White Paper Policing A New Century: A Blueprint for Reform	CRTP's introduced - These were additional payments for those officers, already at the top of their pay scale, who could demonstrate high professional competence		
	2002 PNB agreement on police pay and conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constable pay scale reduced from 15 to 11 points • Sergeants from 6 to 5 • Inspectors from 5 to 4 		
Austerity measures	2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public sector pay freeze (2 years) introduced. • Freeze on incremental progression subsequently lifted (following determination of the Police 		

		Arbitration Tribunal)		
<p>Austerity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioned on 1 October 2010 Recommendations required to enable the public service to manage its resources to serve the public more cost effectively, taking account of the current state of public finances. 	Winsor Review 2011/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concluded principal purpose of pay is to provide sufficient reward to recruit and retain officers of the right quality, No recruitment and retention issues found police officers' (constables and sergeants) average earnings are 10 to 15% above those of the other emergency occupations and comparable ranks in the armed forces Level of earnings is on a par with many white collar professions whose members require many more formal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) used for pay comparison. <u>International comparison</u> counterparts in Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, New Zealand, Sweden and the United States of America. Australia, Canada and New Zealand on par the rest just below (USA arrangements too dissimilar to compare) No future methodology for benchmarking pay proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given its brief – this review was more about cost cutting (at a time when the economy saw recruitment and retention issues at a high) as opposed to determining what fair and appropriate pay should be. A very market led view – as defined by principle purpose of pay. <p>Relevant recommendations NOT ADOPTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduction of <u>Foundation and Specialist skills test</u> to access higher levels of pay (skills related pay)

		<p>educational qualifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay growth higher than the norm. <p>Key Pay changes (basic pay only):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New shorter pay scales (in part reflecting legal challenges to longer scales). • Removal of overlap of Constable and Sergeant scales • Lower pay for new recruits 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Performance related pay</u> (at least a satisfactory grade) • Police Pay Review Body to review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - London Lead arrangements for inspecting ranks - Consider increasing gaps between constable & sergeant and inspector and chief inspector pay scales
--	--	--	--	--