

POLICE FEDERATION INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Overview of evidence

The trusted voice for frontline officers

INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE POLICE FEDERATION
CHAIR SIR DAVID NORMINGTON | JANUARY 2014

www.thersa.org

RSA
Action and Research Centre

Contents

1. The process	3
2. Overview of key evidence	6
3. Why has this evidence been anonymised?	31
Annex 1 – Consultee list	32

1. The process

The Independent Review began its consultation in May 2013 and it was formally concluded at the end of September 2013. Some additional evidence was gathered after this point to supplement information, fill in gaps, and meet with a number of individuals who were not available prior to the end of the formal consultation period. The approach from the outset was one of openness, the deployment of a range of research methodologies, and panoramic in the sense that it engaged with a full range of internal and external Police Federation stakeholders and a range of experts relevant to our considerations. Research for the Independent Review (IR) was carried out by the Secretariat from the RSA and they were helped by a number of external research providers and information supplied by the Police Federation at national and local branch level. We are extremely grateful for all the help and goodwill offered to the Independent Review and its Secretariat by such a wide range of individuals and organisations.

The Independent Review is the most comprehensive exercise in research and consultation ever conducted in relation to the Police Federation by a long way. At no point in the organisation's history has any such process come anywhere near to that undertaken by the Independent Review. This evidence has been scrutinised and analysed at every stage of our deliberations.

Our interim findings underpinned the key characteristics of reform outlined in the Progress Report published in October 2013. The conclusions of our research inform the recommendations made in the final report though, of course, we have also come to our own conclusions and made our own observations as we have gone about the Review.

A clear picture of the Police Federation has emerged as a result of the ambitious range of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies deployed in the undertaking of the Review. We are confident in the rigour and reliability of the research methodologies and the results produced. We have relied on no single methodology. Instead, we have been deliberately wide-ranging in our approach. We were reassured by the degree to which many consistent themes emerged across methodologies. Methodologies include:

- **A survey conducted by the internationally renowned market research company, Ipsos MORI (completed by approximately 12,500 respondents).** This survey was neither a ballot of all members nor a survey encompassing a purely random selected sample of Federation members (as this is not feasible given the lack of a centralised list of contacts from which a sample can be drawn). However, the research does provide a robust and widespread gauge of opinions among over 12,000 Federation members, with significant coverage across ranks and forces.

- **A survey conducted by the RSA through the Survey Monkey online tool (approximately 5,000 respondents).** This survey built in a qualitative component which allowed respondents to give details and unprompted responses to three questions. The findings of this survey informed the Ipsos MORI questionnaire and enabled us to take a temperature gauge of the salience of particular concerns.
- **A survey conducted by the Constables' Central Committee (approximately 2,500 respondents).** Upon completion some of the results were made available to us.
- **An online consultation** to which over 400 individuals and groups responded including 25 official submissions from Joint Branch Boards (JBBs). The questions were based on the Terms of Reference for the Review.
- **Fourteen evidence sessions with members of the Panel and key internal and external stakeholders.** Interviewees included Police Federation staff and national representatives; representatives of other staff associations; representatives from minority support groups; providers of member services; representatives of statutory bodies; and members of the media.
- **Seven regional consultations in England and one in Wales.** These consultations provided an opportunity for the Panel to meet with each region's elected Branch Board Chairs and Secretaries, workplace representatives and members. We also took the opportunity to meet a number of chief constables, Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) and other senior officers on these visits.
- **Five focus groups with members.** The attendees of these groups were both arbitrarily and self-selected for the purpose of gaining a more nuanced understanding of members' views on the value of the Police Federation and the services provided to them by the organisation. It was also useful to speak with officers who spend the bulk of their time 'on the beat' as they were able to offer the Panel their perspectives on how policing has changed over time, particularly in recent years, and how this has in turn changed what police officers need in terms of support and services as members of the Federation. These focus groups were held in London and the Midlands, South East, South West, and Eastern regions.
- **Two academic expert seminars.** One seminar was with leading experts in industrial relations and the other was with experts in policing. It was particularly important to gain an understanding of policing issues and debates as this has wider implications for the Police Federation's identity – both in understanding the extent to which the Federation acknowledges and reflects what modern policing is from the perspective of its members and how it may influence the Federation's role in future. The experts were invited to share their perspectives on what works in policing, what is known about the public's expectations and about the sense of identity and legitimacy held by police officers. The industrial relations seminar focused on how one might measure the effectiveness of a staff representative body which enabled us to develop a baseline for evaluating the Police Federation.

- **One-to-one meetings with individuals and groups conducted by Panel members and the IR Secretariat.** These included meetings with national politicians and policy makers, leaders of policing organisations, chief constables, Police and Crime Commissioners, the media, senior external stakeholders, similar Police Federations such as those in Northern Ireland and Scotland, leading academic experts, think tanks, and other representative organisations.
- **A series of data requests were accommodated by the local branches and the national Federation.** These enabled us to gain a picture of the organisation in terms of representative numbers, diversity, Federation business, finance (albeit with some significant gaps as outlined in the main report), legislation, regulations, and previous reports.
- The IR Secretariat and the Panel Chair attended national meetings of Chairs and Secretaries and the Joint Central Committee (JCC), and the Secretariat attended the national Chairs and Secretaries’ meetings of constables, sergeants, inspectors and meetings of the Women’s Reserved Seat representatives.

The evidence gathering revolved around the Terms of Reference, which were set by the Police Federation and accepted by the Independent Review. Our research sought to determine whether the Federation:

- Acts as a credible voice for rank and file police officers
- Genuinely serves the public good as well as its members’ interests
- Is able to influence public policy on crime and policing in a constructive manner
- Is an example of organisational democracy and effective decision-making at its best allowing genuine ownership of the organisation by police officers and effective communication between members and the Federation at all levels
- Is recognised as a world class leader in “employee voice”.

To be clear, the illustrative statements presented in the following overview of evidence are not necessarily statements of fact, but indicative of perceptions and possibly some misconceptions which arise through a lack of openness and transparency on such matters.

2. Overview of key evidence

Below, we have aimed to provide a balanced overview of the range of evidence that we received in the various forms outlined above. It is impossible to do justice to the volume of evidence we received but we attempt here to give a broad picture of some of the contributions and data we analysed. Every single submission was reviewed and every person who expressed a view in either our evidence sessions or the regional consultation was taken into account. At every stage, all Panel members were kept informed of the range of evidence we were receiving.

We have taken the ‘key characteristics’ from the Progress Report below and presented a picture of the evidence we received in underpinning our decision to accept the particular key characteristic. Following the Progress Report, we then began an exercise in building a coherent architecture for a reformed Police Federation on the back of the key characteristics. We looked at case studies of different ways of arranging an effective organisation using examples within the Federation itself at a local level, ideas that we heard or were submitted to us, other trade unions and staff associations, and even examples outside of the “employee voice” environment.

The recommendations in the final report comprise a number of these examples, many of which are referenced, as well as our own ideas and innovations. In this paper, our intention is to demonstrate the major contribution made to the development of key characteristics that are the foundation of all that is proposed in the final report. We take each key characteristic in turn. At the beginning of each section below, we have drawn out a number of key points and then provide further detail.

A. Alignment of professional and public interests

- More than 12,000 members who responded to the Ipsos MORI poll were clear that it is important for the Police Federation to explain the value of police officers to the general public. More than half (roughly 7,500) felt that the organisation was failing to do so and needed to step up its efforts to connect with the public.
- Nearly 1,000 responses to the questions in the qualitative section of the Survey Monkey questionnaire cited the Police Federation’s seemingly weak influence with government, the media and the public as reasons for rating the organisation poorly. This

is a very high number given the unprompted, open nature of these questions.

- Of these responses, about 400 were explicit in their appeal for the organisation to develop a positive media presence.
- Responses to the online consultation, on balance, revealed that members tend to agree that the Police Federation should be seen as acting in the best interests of the public as well as its membership.

In our online and regional consultations, as well as in the Rank Branch Board (RBB) meetings for Chairs and Secretaries, we did encounter some members and representatives who were firm in their belief that the aim of policing is to serve the public, but that the Police Federation's sole purpose is to serve its members. The Terms of Reference were challenged specifically on the grounds that some did not agree that the Federation could or ought to 'genuinely serve the public good as well as its members' interests.' They were under the impression that there was a conflict of interest between what the public wanted and what the police wanted. There were others who were less certain about making this distinction, but were questioning whether serving the public falls under the remit of the organisation, or felt that they were not in a position to judge whether it did or should.

More typically, however, respondents asserted that the Federation should be serving the interests of the public, but that it currently did not. In the wake of the Andrew Mitchell affair, our evidence suggests that members are sensitive to the fact that the integrity of the police service as a whole is being questioned. They recognise that public regard for their value is waning and that this in turn may affect the extent to which government subjects the service to cuts.

In acknowledgement of this, more than 12,000 members polled by Ipsos MORI were clear that the Federation has an important role to play in explaining the value of police officers to the general public. It is clear that members believe that the Federation's arguments would gain more traction if the connection between their interests and the public's was made more apparent. While members are deeply concerned about how changes to their terms and conditions will affect them personally, they are also considering the impact that this will have on the service they provide to the public and are intent for the public to realise this.

How important, if at all, do you think it is that the Police Federation explains the value of police officers to the general public?

Fairly important/very important	95 percent
Not very important/not at all important	4 percent

Tellingly, more than half of these respondents were under the impression that the Federation was doing a fairly poor or very poor job of articulating the value of officers to the public.

On balance, to what extent do you think the Police Federation does a good or poor job of explaining the value of police officers to the general public?

Fairly good/very good	25 percent
Fairly poor/very poor	57 percent

Some members were able to elaborate on the approach they wished the Federation to take in their responses to the online consultation.

“The Police Federation of Northern Ireland (PFNI) is a very good example of where they support their officers while at the same time telling the public about [much of] the good work officers carry out and the dangers they face on a daily basis without prejudicing the integrity of investigations and protecting the security of officers and the organisation.”

Constable, Sussex

Other stakeholders echoed members’ concerns about the way in which the Federation was presenting its case for preserving the welfare and efficiency of officers to the public. It was often felt that the Federation’s response to proposed changes was marked by uniform resistance and defensiveness. These external stakeholders often identified a failure of the Police Federation to evolve to better meet the public’s needs, with the organisation seen as having a weak grasp of the context of wider public service reform in which these changes are taking place. This was an almost universal criticism by external stakeholders of a variety of forms, persuasions and interests.

“In general, the PFEW [Police Federation of England and Wales] has felt the need to be negative. They fall into easy ‘reactionary responses’. This compounds the wider police ‘image issue’.”

Senior policing official

“PFEW should play the ‘politics of public interest’; for example, align itself with the public on policing matters as a means to legitimise its more sectional demands. The question should be: ‘what sort of police service should we be?’”

MP

Members are aware that both the public’s and politicians’ perceptions of the Federation are affected by the media’s portrayals. As many as 11,000 members responding to the Ipsos MORI poll were of the opinion that is important for the Federation to manage its external image with the media.

How important, if at all, do you think it is that the Police Federation manages its external image with the media?

Fairly important/very important	91 percent
Not very important/not at all important	7 percent

However, respondents also felt that this was an area in which the Federation was failing to deliver. Their dissatisfaction with the Federation's level of engagement was evident in the response to the Survey Monkey questionnaire; nearly 1,000 responses cited the Federation's seemingly weak influence with the public, government, and the media as reasons for scoring the organisation poorly. These were unprompted responses, ie not in answer to a specific, closed question. We assess this number, consequently, to be highly significant. A further 400 respondents were explicit that the Federation could improve its standing with them as well as the public and government if they were more successful in developing a positive media presence. There was admission from within the organisation that the communications strategy was being compromised by internal wrangling and structural issues.

“PFEW has some internal tensions with how it speaks on behalf of its membership because of its current national, regional and local structures. At times JBB offices are able to respond very effectively to local issues and are more likely to generate local media and community interest. However, this has at times provided a tension with the centre which essentially has no control over local JBB offices. This has undermined some national work that was being negotiated quietly in the background. A clear joined [up] communication strategy that all are signed up to needs to be agreed and developed.”

National Police Federation representative

This comment also points to a lack of unity within the Police Federation that we will revisit later.

A significant number of both members and stakeholders were in agreement that, in order to turn the tide of public opinion, the Federation should not risk being seen as purely self-interested and inwardly focused. Many felt that there are opportunities for the Federation to contribute to wider debates on policing which could enrich its image and help foster the legitimacy needed to act authoritatively on behalf of members.

“[PFEW's] voice needs to reflect the professional nature of policing to ensure we can engage the public in viewing the Federation and its members as credible.”

Chief inspector, Greater Manchester

“To be effective, PFEW needs to balance arguments for welfare and efficiency. It needs to both be present in discussions about operational policing (efficiency) and ‘pay and rations’ (welfare).”

Former senior representative of the Police Federation

One of the senior police officers we met was typical in specifying that in order for the organisation to become a credible voice in policing or the ‘voice of the police’ it needs to represent more than just its members and begin to encompass the public's interests as well. The individual argued that it discredits the service if the majority appear to be obsessed with pay and conditions. Rather, they should be putting their best foot forward by highlighting their achievements (for example, officers who provide

high-level victim care). The message to the public should be that “someone who looks like you is putting themselves in harm’s way for the greater good”, it was argued.

Another senior police officer echoed this sentiment. It was in their opinion that the Police Federation assumes that they have public sympathy which is not there.

“[They sound] like the drunk at the party shouting louder and louder to get attention, but putting people off instead.”

Senior police officer

A number of chairs and secretaries are attuned to this problem, in particular because they are concerned that members’ tendency had been to treat the Federation as if it was merely a ‘car insurer’. In response, many feel that the Federation should be developing a credible, professional voice that government and senior officers would be keen to listen to and which would thus demonstrate to members that the organisation was deserving of higher esteem and engagement.

B. Exemplary in standards of behaviour and ethics

- Members are much attuned to the fact that the way in which the Police Federation conducts its business can affect the public’s confidence in policing. They are concerned that the recent conduct of Police Federation representatives has been damaging to the reputation of police as a whole, particularly in light of the Andrew Mitchell affair. We note that a recent YouGov poll conducted in October 2013 found that more than a fifth (22 percent) of the public trusts the police less following the incident with Andrew Mitchell.
- There are doubts over whether the Police Federation is maintaining its credibility as a non-partisan organisation. Some members iterated the importance of Police Federation representatives maintaining political neutrality when advocating on their behalf.
- Members and stakeholders alike believe that Police Federation representatives should adhere to the same standards of behaviour and ethics that police officers do to reassure the public of the organisation’s credibility and protect the legitimacy of policing.

Many members believe that the public makes little distinction between the Police Federation and police officers. On this basis, they were concerned that the Andrew Mitchell affair affected the reputation of the policing profession as well as that of the organisation. Only one in 20 quotes from the online consultation referencing this affair and its impact was positive; the majority were under the impression that the incident had been harmful to police and the Federation alike.

“[The] ‘Plebgate’ saga was embarrassing and I feel reflected badly on the police as a whole.”

Constable, London Metropolitan

“The publicity around the ‘Plebgate’ matter has eroded any credibility the PFEW had. The public have little interest in the PFEW and judge the police service as a whole.”

Constable, Suffolk

“[PFEW representatives should] realise that we are all in this together and that their actions and words impact on us all; supporting ‘Plebgate’ with clearly limited information is an example.”

Inspector, London Metropolitan

There has been speculation in the media that the representatives involved in the Andrew Mitchell affair were politically motivated, and while this is unsubstantiated there were members who shared the same view.

“If ‘Plebgate’ told us anything as an organisation it is not to engage in silly political games which harm the reputation of both the police and Federation.”

Sergeant, West Yorkshire

Suspicion of political intentions may have its roots in rumours of how Police Federation representatives have engaged with the opposition party in their bid to counter reforms to members’ pay and conditions.

“Nationally, I think the Federation has to be far more intelligent in dealing with the government, PCCs and ACPO [Association of Chief Police Officers]. It is no good seeking confrontation with the people who govern your terms and conditions and at the same time sucking up to the opposition... This hardly shows the Federation to be politically neutral and causes damage in political circles.”

Constable, Cheshire

This was a point reinforced for us by a number of external stakeholders.

In an evidence session with another staff association, it was made clear that their organisation’s approach to advocating for its members was based on nurturing long-term relationships with all stakeholders. They said that there was “no point in fighting” with the government. Rather, the representatives of that body were focused on proposing alternatives and collaborating with government to limit any repercussions that reform may have for its members.

There is widespread support from members to hold representatives to account based on their adherence to the same set of principles they follow as officers of the law. Their legitimacy with the public depends on demonstrating the very integrity which they expect of the citizens they police. Examples were cited by a range of audiences including many members, some representatives and, on a regular basis, by external stakeholders, of breakdowns in discipline within the Federation, such as the confrontational behaviour on display in front of Theresa May at Conference. One Police and Crime Commissioner argued that only through recapturing the public’s good will and sympathy would the Federation be able to get anywhere in negotiation rounds and stressed that the organisation should be concentrating on establishing a ‘dignified, measured presence.’

This point about legitimacy was also made salient by experts in our academic seminar on policing. One highly respected academic noted that the legitimacy to deploy state power has to be reinforced by the Police Federation. Essentially, representatives of the Federation should bear in mind that the way in which they behave influences how people regard the police and interact with officers in future, affecting the very legitimacy of the Office of Constable. As such, representatives should conduct themselves in an ethical manner and encourage the same of their members.

Fellow attendees Ben Bradford and Jonathan Jackson sum this up succinctly in a paper providing a conceptual review of police legitimacy.¹ A central argument made is as follows:

“The legitimacy of the police is not simply a given, or pre-ordained, but is an important sense created and reproduced by the mundane actions of officers going about their daily business... Public perceptions of fairness, equitability and transparency of procedure may be central in securing support for and cooperation with, institutions such as the police.”

In this sense, the ethics, behaviours, and attitudes of representatives of the Police Federation are crucial in maintaining and, at the very least, not detracting from wider police legitimacy. Wider legitimacy impacts the general environment in which every police officer is expected to undertake their duties: their efficiency in other words.

C. Accountability

- More than 400 respondents to the questions in the qualitative section of the Survey Monkey questionnaire specified that their opinion of the Federation would improve if the organisation could demonstrate more transparency and accountability.
- There is concern following the Andrew Mitchell affair that the accountability mechanisms within the organisation are either too few or inadequate. The absence of tenure and the difficulty of enacting ‘Schedule 6’ as a lever for removing wayward representatives from office were raised repeatedly.
- The local representatives are concerned about member apathy and their lack of engagement with the Federation at all levels.
- Members do not directly decide who their leadership will be, which some felt was ‘undemocratic.’ They also tend to view their national representatives as detached and ‘out-of-touch’ because they carry their duties out remotely rather than in contact with the frontline.

The call for accountability has intensified following the Andrew Mitchell affair, which a number of consultees saw as emphasising the absence of effective mechanisms for holding representatives to account.

1. Jackson, J. and Bradford, B. (2010) Police legitimacy: A conceptual overview. National Policing Improvement Agency. For more on police legitimacy, see also Bottoms, A. and Tankebe, J. ‘Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice’ *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 102, no. 1, 2012.

The inability to easily suspend or remove those who are seen to be underperforming in their roles was raised on several occasions, not just by members, but also by representatives who were frustrated by colleagues who were not fulfilling their share of the workload.

“I believe that the Schedule 6 mechanism for the removal of representatives and officials is in need of review... I believe that CPD (Continuing Professional Development) should underpin Schedule 6 or any other such system introduced to deal with unsatisfactory representatives.”

Sergeant, Durham

In addition to the weakness of Schedule 6 (and thus the improbability or inappropriateness of its use), the organisation does not have limited tenure. As a consequence, a number of representatives have been in post for some considerable time. During this time they are not required to remain operationally active, giving members the impression that representatives are ‘out of touch’ with policing and thus ‘weak’ at influencing policy and operations.

“At times I feel that the centre have been on the back foot in identifying issues and responding to concerns of the day because current and relevant policing experience is lacking.”

National Police Federation representative

“Most Fed hierarchy are nearing retirement and have been off the streets for a considerable period of time. How can they reflect the needs of younger serving officers when they have not experienced the demands and fears that 24/7 officers face daily? All the cuts that the government have brought on the police have not affected the Fed hierarchy as [much as] the rest of the force. As such how can they battle from the heart and knowledge of what a 24/7 cop really feels?”

Member, Northumbria

“If there was a requirement that reps maintained fitness for operational work and performed operational duties for a set number of days per year, this would keep them in touch with issues of importance to their members and the public.”

Police force Human Resources department manager

The evidence suggested to us that a balance is needed between retaining experience and ensuring that representatives are close to the ground and conscious of issues that affect day-to-day policing.

The only direct elections members participate in are for their workplace representatives (and many representatives are elected unopposed). Where the issue of direct elections was raised, it was generally in support rather than opposition. The following are a flavour of the comments we received:

“Currently the electorate [for Chair and General Secretary] is restricted to only the 30 members of the JCC – hardly democratic and inclusive when compared to similar organisations.”

PFEW central staff

“Structures are opaque and baroque. Why don’t I get to vote for the Chair? Why can’t I vote for the General Secretary? Democracy, people. ‘Big’ issues and policies should be decided by referendum by the membership. It isn’t too hard, and the membership aren’t thick. It isn’t the central organisation’s beast, it’s ours.”

Chief inspector, Lincolnshire

“I do not know who voted for the current Chairman, what his views were that swung the vote his way or even who the other candidates were. All I do know is that he was NOT elected by the membership, and the membership has no real prospect of removing him, or any other office holder, should they wish to do so.”

Constable, London Metropolitan

One JBB argued that there was scope to professionally appoint positions based on the criteria for the job (for example, an accountant for the role of Treasurer). If the positions are not professionally appointed, it was recommended by another JBB that the elections should be reformed so that these senior representatives are voted in by a wider electorate. We have taken both these positions into account as we developed proposals around the roles and selection/election processes of the General Secretary and National Chair.

The members’ responses to the online consultation reveal that the current election processes are convoluted and lack transparency. There is limited knowledge among the members of how their Chair and General Secretary were elected or the basis for which they stood for their seats. Although representatives raised members’ apathy towards the organisation as an issue, there is little opportunity for members to partake in organisational democracy aside from either running for or electing the position of workplace representative. The evidence suggests that members feel as if they are not being listened to and, in response, are disengaging.

“The members working on the ground that I speak to don’t feel that they have an effective voice as far as Leatherhead is concerned.”

Inspector, North Wales

This is something that has also been noticed outside the organisation:

“It seems to operate without consultation to rank and file, and many in the organisation remain unaware who their reps are and what they do.”

Academic expert

The workplace representatives in one regional consultation said that their biggest concern was the growing indifference of members to the Federation. Members felt let down by the national Federation when it came to their pay and terms and conditions, and were losing trust in the organisation to adequately represent them, particularly in negotiations. Elections for workplace representatives were not attracting as many candidates, so it was becoming common for people to run unopposed. Younger members in particular were not as interested in joining as representatives. Some of the workplace representatives worried that the democratic

process was breaking down and wondered about what this apathy would mean in the long-term for the Federation. All these considerations fed our determination that the Police Federation should become a body characterised by its accountability.

D. Unity and coherence

- The organisation is divided between the local and the national, as well as along rank lines. The evidence heard during the regional consultation stressed that this causes friction between representatives and jeopardises the unified front of the organisation.
- There is some support for proportional representation, particularly among constables.
- There are internal tensions between some of the regions and, in particular, a ‘Met and the rest’ attitude.

Members are sensitive to internal tensions between JBB representatives and Joint Central Committee (JCC) representatives. While the weak relationship between these two tiers was repeatedly raised by JBB representatives, members and even external actors had picked up on infighting between local and national representatives, as well as between the separate rank committees. A number of individuals the Independent Review (IR) Panel and Secretariat engaged with characterised the organisation – and consequently, its message – as fragmented.

“Officers are left with what is effectively a two-tier representative body. At local level Fed reps represent officers, influence management and help those who are doing an impossible job. The work of these reps is often heroic and goes largely uncredited, but in the bigger picture they, and those who rely on them, are hamstrung by in-fighting and petty politics, the likes of which means that, at national level, communication is chaotic and the message mixed.”

Sergeant, Northumbria

From the perspective of local representatives, these tensions could be alleviated if there was greater inclusion when it came to decision-making. The JCC has struggled to clarify why they have made certain decisions that may have been viewed as controversial. In forums where the two bodies come together, such as the quarterly JBB Chairs’ and Secretaries’ meetings, the local representatives are dissatisfied with how the JCC responds to their anxieties.

“When attending the national JBB Chairmen and Secretaries’ meeting we are very regularly told that ‘this is not a decision-making forum.’”

Elected representative, Surrey

“There is a view that the JCC are untouchable and the local JBBs are unable to influence their decisions. The classic example of this was the building of PFEW HQ at Leatherhead when there were calls from across

the country for it to be centralised, ie Milton Keynes or Birmingham. This was ignored and many people felt aggrieved.”

Constable, Northamptonshire

Relations between members and national representatives have deteriorated as the national Federation is perceived to be insufficient at communicating with either the JBB or members. The absence of a national database has meant that messages from the centre must make their way down through the many layers of the organisation in order to reach all of the intended recipients. This is a complicated and drawn-out process. It exacerbates distrust and a sense of disconnect between members and both their local and national representatives.

“If the National Secretary sends out an important e-mail, it can take days to filter down to regional/force level and then local level representatives to be passed to members, sometimes with a representative’s own slant put on it.”

Constable, West Yorkshire

“The local members keep us informed, but the national part of the organisation seems very distant.”

Sergeant, Thames Valley

The experience of the Winsor reforms was a bruising one for the organisation and it was clear that many parts of the Police Federation had turned in on each other as a consequence of the severe challenges posed to the organisation. There was a tendency to point the finger at other parts of the organisation as being self-interested from many respondents to our online consultation and in regional consultation sessions. Whatever the rights and wrongs of how the negotiations were conducted, this internal friction between the local and the centre and between ranks was notable in the evidence.

“The officers most hurt and affected by the Winsor Reports were constables as they are the youngest in service and therefore lost out the most by these reforms. I agree that reforms were needed, but there is a feeling that the needs and views of constables were not put forward or heard. I believe we are stronger as a joint body, but the makeup of that body needs to truly represent its members.”

Constable, West Midlands

These divides led in some cases to a discussion on the desirability of ‘proportional representation’ (ie rank representation in proportion to numbers of members). Some cautioned that this would negatively impact upon constables because of the loss of the influence which sergeants, inspectors and chief inspectors may have with the chief constable and Police and Crime Commissioner in their respective areas. As the more senior ranking officers within the force, sergeants and inspectors have sometimes formed stronger and more credible relationships with chief constables and PCCs. The other side of this coin as some representatives articulated to us in regional consultation is that they may be seen as ‘management’

rather than ‘rank-and-file’ and this can create conflicts. Overall though, as the Ipsos MORI survey showed, 47 percent of respondents favoured more reflection of rank numbers in Police Federation structures. However, 87 percent of respondents thought it ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ important that the Police Federation continue to represent constables, sergeants and inspectors (including chief inspectors).

“It is the case that the combined federated ranks have more in common than divides them and should stand as one. There is an increasing gulf in the nature of the duties of and expectations between the ranks of inspector and chief inspector, yet the combined ranks only hold the same weight of the other individual rank committees. There is a real danger that if the interests of the individual supervisory ranks do not carry some weight then there may be a temptation to form a supervisory alliance, perhaps with another staff association. This would be to the detriment of all Federation members, but especially the constables who, although in the majority, would lose the credibility of support from the supervisory ranks.”

Inspector, Humberside

“Officers with supervisory responsibility will often have a better grasp of the way their respective organisations work and are better able to negotiate issues that they fully understand... I also think that officers are better represented by representatives with supervisory rank in discipline cases as their voice tends to hold more weight because they generally have a better understanding of the balance around issues.”

Sergeant, Surrey

There were many of ‘supervisory rank’ willing to admit that the current proportions of rank representation within the organisation are not sustainable. Members are clearly considering alternatives to the current structure that may be more representative.

“There must be proportional representation to achieve a truly democratic organisation. How can it be that those who represent six percent of the members have 33 percent of the representatives?”

National Police Federation representative

“Eighty percent of our membership are constables. Thirty-three percent of the JCC are constables. Does this add up? Certainly the feelings of constables are that it doesn’t and I tend to agree. I say this cautiously as there are definite benefits in a structure that doesn’t allow a single rank to have a majority. A possible solution would be a proportional representation across the ranks without having a single rank making up more than 49 percent of the JCC.”

Inspector, North Wales

There was also some strong feeling against this view, however. The following represents the type of argument we heard against:

“Although I am sympathetic to the principle of proportional representation, I do not believe that it would be in the interests of members for

PFEW to adopt such an electoral system. To do so would remove the ability in a joint organisation to recognise the views of our members, in a system which becomes dominated by one rank.”

Sergeant, Durham

In one regional consultation, the balance between the Metropolitan Police Federation and other branches was also raised (as indeed it was when we met the Metropolitan Police Federation directly). There was a discussion of tensions with the Metropolitan branch of the organisation, which the Metropolitan JEC and RBBs also attested to, but the representatives attending this regional consultation session concluded that the Metropolitan branch should ultimately remain within the Federation as well as having a degree of representation reflecting their size. This is a relevant debate for the organisation considering that Metropolitan representatives have revealed that in spite of their numbers and resource, they can feel marginalised by the other branches and regions during decision-making processes. A senior police officer reflected on this issue, suggesting that because of this internal strife the Metropolitan region might be tempted to go its own way. However, the same individual warned that such a split would be “playing right into the hands of government who would prefer to see the organisation divided.”

E. An ‘every member counts’ ethos

- Evidence received from all branches shows that there is a serious issue with under-representation of minority groups.
- BME respondents to our Ipsos MORI survey expressed a desire to see more proactive steps being taken to improve representation of BME members. Female respondents were more evenly divided but many broached the Panel with private concerns about the removal of Women’s Reserved Seats.
- Our online consultation had a number of responses expressing concern that young-in-service members face a number of specific issues and these concerns have not been adequately responded to by older-in-service representatives.
- The issue of the ‘Leatherhead culture’ as a barrier to women and other minorities with the Police Federation becoming more involved was raised on a number of occasions.

In addition to the imbalances of power between ranks, the profile of representatives, both at a local and national level, is a major concern for the organisation – they tend to be much older, white and male than the police force profile. As of spring 2013, 5.2 percent of police officers in England and Wales were from a black and minority ethnic (BME) background in contrast with the national average of 13 percent. In London, the proportion was higher at 10.5 percent, but this falls well below the city’s BME make-up of 40.2 percent. At a JBB level, BME officers make up 4 percent of Police Federation representatives across England and Wales and 4.8 percent in London. Of the senior JBB representatives, including

Chairs, Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries, 1.6 percent identify as BME. However, when members were polled it was only those who self-identified as BME who were in agreement that the Federation should do more to increase the proportion of Police Federation representatives from minority groups.

Do you think the Police Federation should do more to increase the proportion of minority group Police Federation representatives?

	Male	Female	BME
Yes	22 percent	29 percent	52 percent
No	39 percent	36 percent	22 percent

Female officers in the Federation fare better than their BME counterparts, but are helped by the Women’s Reserve Seats. Women thus constitute 20.6 percent of the representatives at a JBB level, although this is still lagging behind the proportion of women in the forces (27 percent). Their level of representation is weaker among the senior JBB officials – only 14.7 percent of these posts are occupied by women. However, in spite of their relatively higher levels of representation (ie compared to BME members), women holding these seats are still marginalised within JBBs and the JCC (for example, there were instances of Women’s Reserve Seat representatives being forced to appeal to sponsors for funding for the speakers of their national meeting; women’s issues have in the past been relegated to a separate ‘Eve of Conference’).

“Attracting younger members from all walks of life is a problem due to the Federation’s family friendliness. Whilst some improvements have been made in the training courses offered becoming shorter and modular, some courses, like the New Reps course, still require reps from all over the country to attend the Leatherhead HQ for several days without the option of doing the courses ‘part-time’. Reps who work part-time, flexi-time and/or have caring responsibilities, often struggle to attend these courses.”

National Police Federation representative

When polled and in public discussions (for example, during the regional consultations), there was little acknowledgement of the continued need for the Women’s Reserve Seat or equality measures more generally. Typically, male representatives in particular either expressed indifference or opposition to Women’s Reserve Seats and some women were clear that their preference was to be elected through the ‘normal’ or usual route rather than through the use of the Women’s Reserve Seat. An expert on representativeness explained that a number of people within the organisation resented the use of positive action because they either believed that it put some people at an unfair disadvantage, or particularly if they were from an underrepresented group, felt that they could demonstrate their ability without special measures.

The Police Federation is committed to equal opportunities. Do you think the Police Federation should do more to increase the proportion of female representatives?

	Male	Female	BME
Yes	18 percent	35 percent	41 percent
No	43 percent	39 percent	27 percent

However, while women may be hesitant to publicly defend the use of Women’s Reserve Seats, there have been a number of private conversations in which women within the Federation have come forward to iterate the importance of these Seats. The representatives who have thus stressed the need for Reserve Seats are concerned that the dissolution of such measures would further weaken their level of representation within the organisation. They believe that women are better positioned to address issues that are particularly pressing to female police officers, such as part-time and flexible working or maternity leave, and that these matters would go ignored and unresolved without their contributions as representatives. The split in the Ipsos MORI survey amongst female respondents was pretty evenly divided on this question as the table above demonstrates.

None of the members with other protected characteristics, such as BME, LGBT, or disabled members, benefit from such explicit measures of positive action to correct their lack of representation within the Federation. This may in part explain why sub-groups or ‘support associations’ (ie Gay Police Association, National Black Police Association) have been established to provide a forum for alternative voices. There were debates about whether this is the most appropriate way of including the voices of these members, which were heard in our evidence sessions with representatives from support associations and our one-to-one meetings.

“There are 17 support associations that the MPF works with. Why should other associations be necessary if the PFEW was doing its job? There is, at the very least, some time cost in dealing with and supporting all the associations and some direct costs also. BME officers etc. do not feel supported by the PFEW. It’s in part to do with ‘how they look and how they are.’”

Senior policing official

“We recognise that national and local branches of the Gay Police Association, as well as other support networks for gay officers, play an immensely valuable role in providing support [for issues experienced at work] and are often relied on by the Police Federation to provide relevant expertise. Lesbian, gay and bisexual police officers should nevertheless expect to receive an appropriate service from the national staff association to which they pay their subscription fees.”

External expert

In spite of the controversy here over the reliance on associations or networks to fill gaps in the support provided by the Federation to its minority members, the absence of such associations or networks for

young-in-service members was identified as a problem on a number of occasions. There are unique challenges faced by young members of the Federation, particularly in a time of austerity and following the outcomes of the Winsor reports. As it stands the lack of representation for this demographic seems to be breeding some resentment.

“I have to work another seven years before I can retire while I will watch colleagues retiring over the next 15 years on the full pension they signed up to, which I will be paying with my contributions. That just isn’t fair. The government seems to think the young-in-service will not put up a fight on the matter. If more Federation hierarchy were being affected as I am, they might be more active in doing something about it.”

Constable, Metropolitan Police Service

“The Police Federation at a national level think only of their own individual circumstances and not of the police force as a whole. I personally believe that their members should be representative of all police officers and not constitute those with more than half their service completed as it is quite clear from recent events that there can be huge differences in agenda’s between officers with much police service and those only young in their police career.”

Constable, North Wales

“The Fed is overwhelmingly white, male and over 40. Younger officers have been disproportionately hit by the pensions changes and some link this to the vested interests of those negotiating on their behalf most of whom are unaffected. While we need experience, there also needs to be a balance in these areas if we are to represent effectively.”

Sergeant, West Midlands

Questions about how the Federation can begin to draw a greater mix of young, female, and ethnically diverse members into more influential roles were raised on a significant number of occasions.

“Throughout the structures of the Police Federation, the absence of ethnic diversity is striking. The PFEW’s refusal to consider the idea of reserve seats within the Joint Branch Board for BME officers has been a source of contention for many years, particularly considering the existence of female reserve seats.”

Minority staff association

Low levels of member engagement could also be interpreted as resistance to the so-called ‘Leatherhead culture’ which permeates. There are misgivings amongst members and local representatives about the manner in which the JCC, as well as the separate rank committees, use and account for the Federation’s funds; specifically, there are concerns about ‘undeserved’ perks, expenses and honoraria. This feeds belief that the Federation is an exclusive and antiquated ‘old boys’ club’, preventing the participation of those who do not see themselves reflected in the representation. In one member focus group and on a number of other occasions, the issues of overnight stays for training, etc. when representatives have

families was raised. This reticence to engage with the Leatherhead culture was also linked to a macho environment at the HQ facility. Many argued that this was one factor lying behind the slow move to greater diversity and equality with the Police Federation.

F. Transparency

- Funding arrangements are contentious, in part because there are concerns about financial transparency within the organisation.
- The existence of “Number 2 accounts” has been cause for suspicion within the organisation.
- Members are questioning whether they are receiving ‘value for money’ for their subscriptions. There are particular financial inefficiencies within the organisation which fuel members’ perceptions that their money could be put to better use.

The funding arrangement is contentious. Alternatives have been proposed – including in the 2010 BDO report on subscription income – that the Federation’s funding should be centralised, but there is a great deal of resistance from JBBs. Larger JBBs tend to have more income at their disposal and appear to be apprehensive about a model which would give greater discretion to the centre over these funds and could jeopardise how much they retain. However, some smaller JBBs are struggling to stay afloat on the 30 percent of fees they are allotted. The administration fees collected from member services are considered to be a secondary income for JBBs, vary locally and are managed in distinct accounts, commonly referred to within the organisation as Number 2 accounts. We had more to say on these accounts within the final report itself.

Few members appear to even be aware of the existence of Number 2 accounts. Following the publication of the Progress Report, the Panel approached all Chairs and Secretaries asking them for further information about any funds or accounts that they hold which are not reported to the Treasurer. This request resulted in the following response:

- Three JBBs who hold such accounts and do not report the information to the JCC were willing to provide details of their additional accounts (out of a total 43 JBBs).
- Thirteen JBBs did not respond at all, 30 did so.
- Thirteen JBBs in total out the 30 who responded have such accounts, seven of which disclose information from these accounts on their annual return to the JCC.

The dearth of transparency here is obviously a cause for concern.

Respondents raised suspicions that their subscription fees (albeit, because they are unaware of the Number 2 accounts they cannot accurately discern where the money has originated) were being squandered inappropriately and unjustly on personal expenses by elected representatives. What appeared to be particularly unsettling to respondents was that the power imbalance between elected officials and members was especially apparent as a result of the way in which elected officials used finances to

entrench the status of senior elected officials (for example, expensive hotel stays, meals, etc.).

“My concern with the PFEW is the lack of transparency in relation to its financial matters. I was recently involved in a firearms inquest where we were supported by the PFEW. Whilst my team and I were staying overnight on police premises our Federation representative spent the nights in a very nice hotel in the city centre. A small example perhaps, that the PFEW credit card is used too freely. I suppose the bigger concern with that is that the PFEW member was there to support the firearms officers. How much support was given from this remote location? How does it look to the principal officers that the PFEW member is more important than them?”

Inspector

“Members are just seen as the people who fund the organisation. The Federation is not accountable to them/us and we have no voice. Take the Federation conference for example. Fed reps get a whole week to attend this conference, usually in work time, and at no expense to themselves; it’s all paid for, including food. Yet each rep gets £500 for ‘out of pocket expenses’, which in the Fed world translates as beer money. How can an organisation like this claim to represent the interests of police officers these days, who in the main are professionals working in a framework that demands accountability and transparency?”

Constable

Representatives from within the Federation have also raised concerns about the ways in which money is being managed and spent, not just at a local level, but also nationally. While the evidence is anecdotal, there are serious allegations which could adversely impact the credibility of the organisation with members and the public, if substantiated.

“A whole scale review of the pay structure is needed within Leatherhead. The obvious round of drinks on the boys that occurs at Leatherhead by the JCC on the Fed credit card at members’ expense is disgraceful. There is hospitality, but there seems [to be] abuse of privilege. I feel, as a rep, let down by behaviour and actions I have no power as a rep to challenge; that is clearly wrong... I personally feel let down, and even embarrassed by some behaviour at Leatherhead that I am expected to justify without justification. It is making my position untenable.”

Sergeant

“I have a specific concern with the provision of hospitality at Leatherhead, in particular the purchasing of alcohol and that this needs to be stopped. I am concerned that members’ money is being spent and wasted in this way which also adds to a culture of a bygone era.”

National Police Federation representative

There is also controversy concerning the awarding of honoraria to Federation representatives across the country. Again, honoraria payments differ locally and little of this information is available within or outside of the organisation, and what is available may simply be in aggregated

form. The payments appear to be considered confidential, although it is common practice across similar organisations to disclose these numbers.

“We have tried, in [branch named], to find out who gets them [honorary payments] and why? They refuse, which is why there is suspicion.”

Sergeant

“I would wish to raise the issue of honorarium and the criteria of how this is determined, whether it is appropriate and how it is reviewed. This is a concern that is raised by regional colleagues on a frequent basis but I am unable to give colleagues a clear answer of what the situation is. I am aware of anecdotal comment of varying rates being awarded depending on role, position or rank. This is also an issue within some local JBBs. We need to have a clear and transparent approach to honorarium within the body PFEW if it is actually deemed appropriate.”

National Police Federation Representative

Additionally, the separate funds at the Rank Central Committee (RCC) level add a further layer of financial bureaucracy. It has been revealed that the way in which these separate funds are managed is inefficient. In our evidence sessions we were alerted to the following:

- The JCC is VAT registered, but other committees are not. The JCC thus invoices the separate committees within HQ for their use of the building, the staff lunches, and officers’ hotel use and bar use. VAT is added to the invoice, but the committees cannot claim it back, which increases costs.
- The separate committees have little or no expertise in payroll or accounting principles and have outsourced this in the past. The JCC finance team now prepares payroll on behalf of the Sergeants’ Central Committee and the Inspectors’ Central Committee and invoices the costs to them.
- The staff pension scheme is administered by JCC and the costs are invoiced to the separate committees.

The RCCs also use a portion of the fees from the members of their respective ranks to pay for separate staff and expenses. This has prompted a number of JBBs to question in their submissions to the Review whether the Federation should continue to be organised along the lines of separate rank boards and committees with individual pots of funding. When the importance of RCCs holding separate fund accounts was raised in the Ipsos MORI poll, members generally felt that this arrangement could not be justified.

At national level, there are currently rank committees with their own budgets and staff. To what extent is it important, if at all, for the Police Federation to remain organised in this way?

Fairly important/very important	30 percent
Not very important/not at all important	44 percent

At a time when members are affected by the wider public sector cuts they feel that there should be greater consideration given to the rate at which subscription fees are set and how this money is then spent. Presently, members are questioning why the rate is as high as it is and are seeking the disclosure of expenses.

“I do not think that we receive good value for money. Without any consultation a few years ago at the annual conference the executive voted in favour of a 24 percent increase in our subscriptions, this was totally wrong. Executive members squander a lot of the Federation’s money on expenses, meetings and honoraria payments. Individuals’ expenses claims should be made available for scrutiny by Federation members.”

Constable, London Metropolitan

“The accountability is lacking, along with transparency of the Federations’ dealings – both monetary and business. As paying members, we should be entitled to know what financial incomings and outgoings are taking place, and how subscriptions are managed and spent. When previous requests have been made, they have been flatly refused. Business interests of members need to be made public and what associations they have with the companies involved – such as the legal firm who represent officers.”

Sergeant, West Yorkshire

“They state that they require more funds through increased subs... Why don’t they do some in-house cost cutting before asking for more money from members who are already feeling the squeeze?”

Constable, Northumbria

A submission to our online consultation from a staff member commented on the inconsistency of decisions made on members’ applications for legal assistance. It was noted that this inconsistency could be construed as ‘unfair’.

“The fund rules determine who gets funding and then there is a written funding criterion that is followed. However, as discretion by the relevant [rank] secretaries can play a big part in the decisions made, this can mean some members may be receiving funding and others may not for the exact same issues... [This] is unfair and sends a mixed message.”

Staff member

The staff member stressed the importance of incorporating an ethical framework within the claims approval process. The staff member suggested that operating procedures for determining the approval of claims be standardised and transparency of decision-making emphasised to prevent decisions being made the grounds of one person’s biases or individual morals.

Furthermore, there are currently three separate claims departments to manage claims from each of the three ranks separately. There was some doubt as to whether this was necessary, particularly in terms of assuring members ‘value for money’. It was implied that there was

little communication or coordination between these separate departments, running the risk of duplication in legal claims and increasing the likelihood of monetary waste. A national representative alerted us to a situation where the rank committee decides on a claim and the JCC has to effectively fund it. This creates a separation between funding and decision-making which results in significant financial risks with little obvious benefit to individual members.

G. Professional and expert

- Over 650 responses to the Survey Monkey questionnaire highlighted local representation as a strength. A further 1,000 responses specified that the advice and support they received on welfare issues at a local level was their primary reason for rating the Federation highly. However, support at a local level can be variable and there is little understanding of or regard for the role of national representatives.
- Of the Survey Monkey responses, nearly 200 members explicitly raised the importance of the service promoting professionalism and expertise.

Local representatives were often described to us throughout our consultation as the ‘key gatekeepers’ to the organisation for the membership. The evidence suggests that members are likely to echo this sentiment. They certainly seem to have a better understanding and appreciation of what their local representatives do, particularly those at a workplace level, than they do of their national representatives. This may be expected given that workplace representatives are the main points of contact for members seeking advice and support on matters of conduct, equality and health and safety. It was made clear that the role of these representatives goes beyond fielding members’ concerns about pay, terms and conditions. They have a responsibility to guide members through regulations and play an integral part in resolving issues of welfare at the micro-level: in the workplace, with management or between colleagues.

“Members need local representation. They need people to fight the small battles for them because for the individual these are the important things.”

Constable, Cheshire

“Members want local representation in the matters that affect them on a day-to-day basis. They want to sit down face-to-face with someone they know and trust and discuss the issue that is causing concern.”

JBB official

At the time of writing, there were few JBBs who had undertaken a cost-benefit analysis to assess the value they offer their force, but the work of local representatives has likely amounted to significant savings for the force and thus, the wider public. This case was made repeatedly outside as well as inside the organisation. Representatives in the regional consultations were confident that their work for the Federation has made efficiency

savings for the force, especially in recent years as the incidences of stress, sickness absence, and marital breakdown have increased. In a submission from one JBB, one of the strengths of local representation was articulated as ‘the ability to balance the needs and welfare of members with the efficiency of the force.’ It went on to explain that local representatives ensure that officers are dealt with fairly and proportionately.

This has been reiterated by the senior police officers and Police and Crime Commissioners we engaged with across the country. Many spoke highly of their relationship with the local Federation, acknowledging the importance of representatives in negotiating on issues of welfare (for example, on working time limits and other conditions of service). There is pride on this point within the organisation.

“The money saved in the public purse by the good works of the Federation, and in particular local reps is a fantastic benefit to the tax payer. The estimation of money saved by resolving issues without going to a tribunal should be something more widely championed, both internally and externally as the value of a good fed rep far outweighs any opposing argument.”

National Police Federation Representative

Some representatives seemed to be under the impression that they had made a personal sacrifice in taking on this role and managers could subsequently view them as ‘troublemakers’ and that this was a hindrance to their chances of promotion. However, the senior police officers we spoke with disagreed on this point. One senior police officer specifically refuted that being a representative was the ‘career killer’ some have made it out to be, and that a role as a representative could actually help form the argument for promotion.

While there was a great deal of praise for local representatives there were also some members who reported a more mixed experience. These members argued that professionalising the representatives’ roles, clearly setting out job descriptions and expectations, and introducing some measures of performance monitoring could go a long way to ensure that the service was one of quality and standardised across branch boards, as well as nationally.

“There is no qualification or skills requirement for a person to stand as a rep, JBB officer, JCC officer, etc. There should be a minimum mandated skills requirement before a person can be eligible to stand for election, which as a minimum for potential local candidates is a familiarisation visit to the JBB offices so that they are aware of the requirements for the role and what can be expected of them.”

Sergeant, Greater Manchester Police

“We should be professional in approach, well-trained with relevant qualifications and skills which will bring credibility to the role.”

Sergeant, Northumbria

Nearly 200 members responding to the Survey Monkey questionnaire made it clear that they would appreciate it if professionalism and

expertise became deeply ingrained within the Federation. However, on this point, it had been raised in regional consultations that the workplace representatives were having difficulty even in accessing current training provisions. They noted that there was uncertainty over whether they would be able to get into the training courses they wanted and that it was a challenge to make it out to the training facilities in Leatherhead. In one regional consultation, it was also stated that the remote location of Leatherhead made it difficult for representatives from some regions to sufficiently engage with opportunities, such as training courses. Women in particular are disadvantaged because of caring responsibilities which prevent them from attending even a one-day course at the Federation headquarters as doing so could eat into as many as three days of their week because of travel time alone. The submission from one JBB called for a reassessment of training facilities now that the mortgage for Leatherhead has been paid off and alternatives are possible.

In a submission from another JBB, representatives noted that the changing nature of the police service also warranted changes to the types of services on offer to members. For example, as cuts to forces continue, the JBB suggested it would be helpful if members had access to sound financial advice and/or subsidised childcare provision. Both the degree and kind of support needed by members has shifted in response to pressures on policing and it is the Police Federation's responsibility to be on the front foot of this.

H. Authoritative and credible

- Over 400 members responding to the Survey Monkey questionnaire revealed that they would speak more highly of the Federation if the organisation improved internal communication. Members are unhappy with the way in which negotiation on their behalf was carried out. This has as much to do with the process as it does with the outcome.
- It was felt that the Federation's representatives are in the best position to represent members' interests as professionals with experience of the service.

Members overwhelmingly support a national database to improve communication between them and their national representatives. The national Federation is also sensitive to the fact that their relationship with members could improve if there was less reliance on a 'middleman' to convey messages and more direct communication. However, they have encountered difficulties in attempting to establish a national database. The reason given for this is that contact details for members are gathered at a local level and some JBBs are withholding this information on the grounds that it was collected via their provision of member services and is thus 'commercially sensitive'.

“In order to be a credible voice for its members, PFEW needs to be able to hear and engage its membership. At the moment we have no central membership contact details and attempts to adopt a central membership database has been resisted by some local branch boards because

of concerns over member services... Unfortunately, there is an issue of trust from within some quarters that means PFEW is unable to take this forward.”

National Police Federation representative

The way in which money flows into and through the organisation has been impeding the natural progression of communication between members and their representatives at the centre. The logic of ‘self-preservation’ that individual JBBs have voiced comes at the expense of the larger organisation’s wellbeing.

“In order to effectively influence policy on behalf of its members, the Police Federation must first ensure that its membership is well-informed by providing them with accurate, timely and in-depth information about key developments in policing and their implications for their members and the Police Service as a whole. The Police Federation’s members need to understand the real potential impact of new and proposed measures in order to give their informed views on them, and the Federation can play an important role in examining the content of proposals and reporting them, and their implications, to their members. In doing so, the Federation should try to achieve the right balance between informing and following the views of their members. This balance is, we believe, absolutely crucial to the Federation’s legitimacy in the eyes of those it represents as well as those it wishes to influence.”

External policing expert

The Federation’s failure to establish a system of internal communication thus far has sorely disappointed members. In their responses, members spoke out most strongly against the way in which their pay and conditions were negotiated without consultation and the lack of clarity over ensuing reforms. Although members understand that this is a time of austerity and that the economic climate has been particularly difficult for the public sector to endure, they are displeased with negotiation on their behalf primarily because they were not included in the process and felt that their voice within the organisation was marginalised.

Numerous examples were cited of issues (such as the rally against cuts in May 2012, the ballot on industrial rights in January 2013, and ongoing reforms to pensions) which the JBB had identified as important to their members, but that the JCC would not take as strong a position on as preferred. The JCC’s stance on these issues, however, is not the concern – the problem is the poor dialogue between local and national representation when these issues are being debated and decisions need to be made.

Taking into account the current economic climate, on balance, to what extent do you think the Police Federation does a good job or a poor job at negotiating pay and conditions on your behalf?

Fairly good/very good	12 percent
Fairly poor/very poor	74 percent

Many local representatives are also frustrated with the national Federation's lack of transparency over negotiation and the rationale for particular outcomes or decisions. In one regional consultation, workplace representatives noted that communication has always been weak, but felt that it was unacceptable that local representatives are on the receiving end of hostility from members because they can't explain what is happening to the pensions as a consequence of the national Federation's silence on the matter.

Another reoccurring criticism of the national Federation in particular is that it is a 'toothless tiger'. Some members and representatives feel that the Police Federation's influence is eroding over pay and conditions, but that this was inevitable for an organisation denied the industrial right to strike. Arguably, the Federation's diminishing influence also reflects how external perceptions of the organisation have changed in recent years.

"The response to the latest rounds of 'police reform' (2008 – date) was largely ineffective and rather than have any significant impact in gaining public support for our concerns, it portrayed us as an organisation resistant to change and believing we should be treated as a 'special case'. Marches through central London, frankly achieved nothing more than a few column inches in the following days' papers and actually won us few supporters in the general public."

Sergeant, Gloucestershire

However, the Federation is in the best position to represent the interests of its members because it is comprised of people who understand policing issues and can use this experience to connect with both members and the wider public. One JBB argued that there is confusion over whether ACPO or the College of Policing is the 'voice of policing', but it should be the Police Federation above these other organisations.

"Police officers on the ground have a real feeling for what the public wants and are able to represent that to those in authority, e.g. views on criminal justice."

Sergeant, Greater Manchester

"Engagement with the public policy agenda promotes internal engagement which brings the union closer to its members. That proximity facilitates greater credibility of voice."

External industrial relations expert

"PFEW is part of the 'collective experience and knowledge of policing' and it needs to use this better to meet its members' needs more effectively."

Former senior representative of PFEW.

3. Why has this evidence been anonymised?

This overview provides a balanced medley of the evidence we have been receiving. We have encouraged all those who have engaged with the Independent Review to be open and frank whether positive or negative, so that we could get a true picture of the Police Federation. Some requested confidentiality. However, we took the decision to protect the anonymity of all those who generously contributed to our review in order to focus more on the substance of the responses rather than the individuals themselves. For example, in some quotes of a sensitive nature we have omitted information that may be potentially identifying, such as location. We did not want to put anyone in a difficult position.

We thank everyone sincerely for taking the time to contribute to the Review.

Annex 1 – Consultee list

In addition to representatives and members from all branches, we have consulted with the following stakeholders:

Police Federation representatives, staff and leading officers

Joint Central Committee
Inspectors' Central Committee
Sergeants' Central Committee
Constables' Central Committee
National meeting of Inspectors' Branch Board Chairs and Secretaries
National meeting of Sergeants' Branch Board Chairs and Secretaries
National meeting of Constables' Branch Board Chairs and Secretaries
National meeting of Women's Reserve Seat representatives

Policing stakeholders

Home Office
Her Majesty's Opposition
Welsh Government
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
College of Policing
Police Negotiation Board
Police and Crime Commissioners and Police and Crime
Panel Representatives
Chief Constables, Deputy Chief Constables and other senior officers
Senior Police Force managers
Association of Chief Police Officers
Police Superintendents' Association of England and Wales
Scottish Police Federation
Police Federation for Northern Ireland
Disabled Police Association
Gay Police Association
National Association of Muslim Police
National Black Police Association
A former senior PFEW representative
Police staff members
Police Community Support Officers

Academic experts

Birkbeck
Cardiff Business School
Glamorgan University
London School of Economics and Political Science
Manchester Business School
University College London
University of Cambridge
University of Leicester
University of Oxford

Additional experts

Heathrow Airport Holdings (formerly BAA)
Independent equality adviser
Involvement and Participation Association
Police Foundation
Police Mutual Assurance Society
RSA Fellows
Stonewall
Taxpayers' Alliance
Trade Union Congress

Responses to online consultation by individual members

Total responses **396**

Gender

Male	350
Female	41
Undisclosed	5

Rank

Chief Inspector	4
Inspector	67
Sergeant	91
Constable	179
Undisclosed	55

Branches*

Region 1: North West

Cheshire	4
Cumbria	1
Greater Manchester	20
Lancashire	2
Merseyside	6

Region 2: North East

Cleveland	4
Durham	5
Humberside	7
Northumbria	18
North Yorkshire	2
South Yorkshire	1
West Yorkshire	17

Region 3: Midlands

Staffordshire	2
Warwickshire	3
West Mercia	8
West Midlands	28

Region 4: Eastern	
Cambridgeshire	4
Derbyshire	19
Leicestershire	5
Lincolnshire	10
Norfolk	3
Northamptonshire	3
Nottinghamshire	2
Suffolk	5

Region 5: South East	
Bedfordshire	6
Essex	7
Hampshire	7
Hertfordshire	10
Kent	16
Surrey	5
Sussex	19
Thames Valley	7

Region 6: South West	
Avon & Somerset	3
Devon & Cornwall	17
Dorset	11
Gloucestershire	7
Wiltshire	3

Region 7: Wales	
Dyfed Powys	0
Gwent	4
North Wales	8
South Wales	3

Region 8: London	
City of London	0
Metropolitan	65

*19 responses could not be identified by branch.

Responses to Survey Monkey poll by individual members

Total number of completed responses 4,730

Gender

Male	3,689
Female	975
Undisclosed	66

Rank	
Chief Inspector	97
Inspector	489
Sergeant	1,183
Constable	2,961

Branches*

Region 1: North West	
Cheshire	24
Cumbria	25
Greater Manchester	239
Lancashire	293
Merseyside	29

Region 2: North East

Cleveland	5
Durham	3
Humberside	12
Northumbria	215
North Yorkshire	19
South Yorkshire	17
West Yorkshire	173

Region 3: Midlands

Staffordshire	73
Warwickshire	68
West Mercia	165
West Midlands	275

Region 4: Eastern

Cambridgeshire	85
Derbyshire	22
Leicestershire	93
Lincolnshire	67
Norfolk	121
Northamptonshire	176
Nottinghamshire	0
Suffolk	32

Region 5: South East

Bedfordshire	5
Essex	56
Hampshire	134
Hertfordshire	232
Kent	26
Surrey	42
Sussex	20
Thames Valley	150

Region 6: South West	
Avon & Somerset	379
Devon & Cornwall	19
Dorset	200
Gloucestershire	18
Wiltshire	130

Region 7: Wales	
Dyfed Powys	61
Gwent	146
North Wales	149
South Wales	71

Region 8: London	
City of London	179
Metropolitan	464

*18 responses could not be identified by branch.

Responses to Ipsos MORI poll by individual members

Total number of completed responses 12,477

Gender

Male	9,946
Female	2,531

Rank

Inspector, including	
Chief Inspector	1,151
Sergeant	2,557
Constable	8,684
Undisclosed	85

Branches*

Region 1: North West	
Cheshire	392
Cumbria	67
Greater Manchester	795
Lancashire	312
Merseyside	224

Region 2: North East	
Cleveland	117
Durham	116
Humberside	348
Northumbria	275
North Yorkshire	108
South Yorkshire	376
West Yorkshire	431

Region 3: Midlands	
Staffordshire	348
Warwickshire	56
West Mercia	252
West Midlands	804
Region 4: Eastern	
Cambridgeshire	138
Derbyshire	133
Leicestershire	257
Lincolnshire	146
Norfolk	217
Northamptonshire	221
Nottinghamshire	341
Suffolk	180
Region 5: South East	
Bedfordshire	55
Essex	442
Hampshire	274
Hertfordshire	260
Kent	488
Surrey	204
Sussex	233
Thames Valley	571
Region 6: South West	
Avon & Somerset	560
Devon & Cornwall	171
Dorset	160
Gloucestershire	65
Wiltshire	155
Region 7: Wales	
Dyfed Powys	77
Gwent	163
North Wales	164
South Wales	149
Region 8: London	
City of London	87
Metropolitan	1,508

*37 responses could not be identified by branch.

The RSA: an enlightenment organisation committed to finding innovative practical solutions to today's social challenges. Through its ideas, research and 27,000-strong Fellowship it seeks to understand and enhance human capability so we can close the gap between today's reality and people's hopes for a better world.



8 John Adam Street
London WC2N 6EZ
+44 (0)20 7930 5115

Registered as a charity
in England and Wales
no. 212424

Copyright © RSA 2014

www.thersa.org
