

POLICE FEDERATION INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Progress Report

INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE POLICE FEDERATION
CHAIR SIR DAVID NORMINGTON | OCTOBER 2013

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. The consultation process	4
3. Imperative to change	6
4. A programme for reform	11
5. Indicative timetable and next steps	16
6. Final comments	17
Appendix	18

1. Introduction

We were set up as an Independent Panel by the Police Federation in the spring and have spent the summer and early autumn hearing evidence and views in person and in writing. We thought it was important to provide this progress report as we reflect further on what we have heard and begin to finalise our recommendations. This report gives an indication on direction of travel. Our final report will come in January 2014.

We are grateful to Federation members, representatives at every level, staff, and the very wide range of external stakeholders for engaging with the Independent Review (IR). It has made the evidence gathering phase of the review a meaningful and substantive one. It is clear that, whatever short-term challenges the Police Federation faces, there is a deep desire throughout policing to see it perform effectively.

It is evident, however, that the Federation needs urgent reform. It has substantially lost the confidence of its members, as the IPSOS Mori poll published alongside this report shows. Its influence and impact on the public and policy debate has declined, just at a time when the police service is undergoing major changes and needs influential voices representing front line officers. It has turned in on itself and risks losing public confidence and its legitimacy to represent front line policing. It must change and change fundamentally. Otherwise it may become an irrelevance or face reform from outside.

This progress report sets out the broad principles for fundamental change on which the recommendations in our final report will be based. We have seen and heard real strengths within the Police Federation. It is easy to forget the vital service that it provides its members, especially at times of individual distress. We believe it can and must be stronger; and in making our recommendations, we will have an overriding objective: to ensure that the Police Federation is able to represent its members' interests as effectively as possible. But to do so it must turn outwards and understand that the police service is effective only if it retains public confidence and respect. Recent events show that the conduct of the Police Federation impacts the public's view of the police.

Moreover, we have been presented with clear evidence that fundamental change is what the members want. It should not be delayed. The imperative for change would be present even if the recent events surrounding the former Chief Whip had never taken place.

Reform cannot be achieved by incremental steps. It requires a redesign from first principles. This means exploring, in sequence, three questions:

- What purpose is the Police Federation there to perform?
- What does effectiveness mean when applied to a body such as the Police Federation? and

- What should be the ‘key characteristics’ of a reformed Police Federation?

There should be no doubt that a robust, credible and bold response is required if the Police Federation is to retain member, policing stakeholder, and public confidence

Our intention is to use these ‘key characteristics’ as the basis for detailed proposals in our final report. There should be no doubt that a robust, credible and bold response is required if the Police Federation is to retain member, policing stakeholder, and public confidence.

At the time of writing that public confidence is being tested as never before by the events surrounding the actions of Federation representatives in their dealings with the former Chief Whip, Andrew Mitchell. Whatever the precise rights and wrongs of the case, those events are damaging the Federation, its members and the wider police service. In our view, amongst many other developments, they reinforce some of the themes in this progress report and underline the urgent need for change, not just in the organisation and representative structure of the Federation, but crucially in its cultures and behaviours.

A major theme of our final report will be the need for the Federation to understand and promote the alignment between public confidence in policing and the interests of its members. Every time it appears to be taking up political and partisan positions and engaging in campaigns against particular individuals, it risks undermining the impartiality and integrity which the public expect from the police. It not only antagonises the very people it is most seeking to influence, it affects wider public confidence on which the legitimacy of the British model of policing rests.

In the course of our enquiry so far we have met leaders at all levels of the Federation who believe it should stand for the highest standards of conduct and behaviour in policing and understand the need to contribute positively to public confidence in the police service.

We have also encountered some who pursue narrow self-interest, some behaviours that should not be tolerated in any way, and a degree of carelessness with the Federation’s reputation from a number of elected representatives at local and national level. If the Federation is to succeed in the future, the membership need to get behind those leaders who want the Federation to stand for all that is best in policing.

2. The consultation process

We pursued an extensive and wide-ranging consultation from the outset. In not relying on a single consultation approach, we reached a wide range of voices within and outside of the Police Federation. There is also a depth to the evidence we have gathered and consistent messages have emerged. Our consultation approaches have included:

- Two IR surveys. One conducted by the internationally renowned market research company, Ipsos MORI (approximately 12,500 respondents) and one conducted by the RSA through the Survey Monkey online survey tool (approximately 5,000 respondents). The Constables' Central Committee have also conducted their own survey (approximately 2,500 respondents) and made some of the results available to us.
- Fourteen evidence sessions with members of the Panel and key internal and external stakeholders.
- Seven regional consultations in England and one in Wales.
- An online consultation to which over 400 individuals and groups responded.
- Focus Groups with members.
- One-to-one meetings with individuals and groups conducted by Panel members and the IR secretariat.
- Academic expert seminars.

In sum, we have engaged with a wide array of individuals throughout the national policing family: national politicians and policy makers, policing organisations and leaders, chief constables, Police and Crime Commissioners, the media, leading academic experts, think tanks, other representative organisations, and every level of the Police Federation itself.

The purpose of this multi-faceted consultation process was to minimise any bias in the evidence so that it could be relied upon in drawing authoritative and credible conclusions. We have engaged over 15,000 members, more than any other comparable survey or study. We are highly confident that the emerging picture, on the basis of analysis of the range of data and evidence, is accurate beyond reasonable doubt.

We have built the consultation process around our Terms of Reference, looking particularly, at 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

We have also considered, as the Terms of Reference required, value for money, the unique position of the Office of Constable, the importance of enhancing public confidence in policing, equality and diversity, and transparency of decision-making.

3. Imperative to change

There are strong internal and external imperatives to change. No one we have heard from has seriously questioned the importance of the police service having effective representation both in the determination of pay and conditions of service and in the wider discussions about policy and operational effectiveness. What is almost universally questioned – from inside and out- is the Federation’s effectiveness in carrying out its role. Later in this report we touch on the almost totally negative views of the Federation from outside stakeholders, but we concentrate first on the views of the Federation’s own members. We do so partly because we are publishing today an Ipsos MORI survey which we commissioned, which tells us what the members think; but more importantly, because the Federation has a history of finding reasons to explain away external criticism. We hope that it may at least listen to its own members. Their views can be summarised as follows:

- They are deeply unhappy with the performance and impact of the Police Federation overall, particularly (but not just) at the national level. Local support and representation is a strength but not consistent enough. This point has come through especially clearly with regard to those with ‘protected characteristics’ (the legal term referring to minority and/or under-represented groups) or particular needs.
- Members are demanding improvement and change. They want to see more evidence that their views are being listened to.
- They do not believe the way that ranks are reflected throughout the Police Federation is necessary or effective.
- They have a far greater engagement and less dissatisfaction with the Police Federation at a workplace and local level than national level and highly value the representation that local representatives provide in a crisis. However, it is not a case of local good, national bad: there are challenges throughout the organisation.
- They want better communications. The absence of a national (and in some cases local) email database is one obvious aspect of this problem. But there are issues beyond the ability to communicate directly. There is a tendency for key information to become ‘stuck’, denied to members and representatives or communicated in a fashion ill-adapted for its member audience. This is often compounded by a lack of trust between individuals and between key parts of the Federation.

- While they want change, they are clear that the Federation should continue to represent all constables, sergeants, inspectors and chief inspectors.

These are powerful and clear messages and provide an imperative for change from within.

There is no doubt that a degree of distance has opened up between the Police Federation and its membership at all levels. It is important to caveat this with the recognition that we are conducting the Review after changes in police pay, pensions and conditions following reductions in funding levels for policing as a whole, the Winsor Review, and the Hutton Review. The intensity of public scrutiny on policing in the wake of a series of police scandals is significant with some calls from major political figures for a fundamental review of behaviour and ethics in policing.

However, external pressure has created internal stress. Strong organisations are resilient under stress. Wherever we have gone in the Federation we have found division: between ranks, between the local and the national, and between members and the organisation as a whole. This division has been symbolised in a noteworthy absence of trust between key organs of the Federation as well as between individuals. This absence of trust has, on occasion, become suspicion and active distrust (sometimes this has been baseless).

This is clear in overall satisfaction figures in the Ipsos MORI survey (table below) and in the Constables' Central Committee's own findings.

To what extent would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the overall performance of the Police Federation?

	Very/fairly satisfied	Very/fairly dissatisfied	Net
Overall	18%	64%	-46%
0–5 years' service	20%	56%	-36%
6–15 years	14%	69%	-55%
15 years +	21%	60%	-39%
Constable	17%	65%	-48%
Sergeant	18%	63%	-45%
Inspector	26%	55%	-29%
BME	20%	61%	-41%
Female	26%	51%	-25%
Male	16%	67%	-51%

This dissatisfaction is reflected in an overwhelming desire for change, albeit with no consensus on the direction for change. Many are focused on an insistence that the Police Federation should achieve different outcomes, especially on pay, pensions, and conditions. But alongside this is a wish to see change in the way the Police Federation communicates, engages, and the transparency/accountability of representatives, especially at a national level.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The Police Federation should change

Tend to agree/strongly agree	91%
Tend to/strongly disagree	2%

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The Police Federation is able to change

Tend to agree/strongly agree	29%
Tend to/strongly disagree	42%

The membership is strongly in favour of change yet has significant doubts over the Police Federation’s capacity to change.

We have not picked up a strong desire amongst the membership for splitting up the Police Federation. The consistency of response is notable across all three ranks.

The Police Federation is a ‘staff association’ which represents constables, sergeants, and inspectors (including chief inspectors). To what extent is it important, if at all, that the Police Federation continues to represent all of these ranks?

	Overall	Constables	Sergeants	Inspectors
Very/fairly important	87%	86%	89%	90%
Not at all/not very	10%	10%	9%	9%

There is support for representation to more closely reflect rank numbers. On the question about whether ‘the proportion of officers within each rank’ should be ‘reflected in Police Federation representation even if that means one rank has a majority over the other two?’, 47 percent were in agreement while 15 percent were against. Inspectors were only slightly in agreement overall: 37 percent to 34 percent.

When it came to rank representation there was a divided view about its importance at workplace level but an absolute majority against in all three ranks, and overall when it came to national representation.

Currently Police Federation representatives are divided by rank. Do you think that representatives at each of the following levels should, or should not be, divided by rank?

Workplace	Overall	Constable	Sergeant	Inspector
Should be	46%	42%	52%	59%
Should not be	43%	44%	40%	36%

Force				
	Overall	Constable	Sergeant	Inspector
Should be	42%	39%	47%	55%
Should not be	45%	46%	45%	40%

National				
	Overall	Constable	Sergeant	Inspector
Should be	35%	34%	36%	44%
Should not be	51%	50%	54%	50%

There are important differences in how positively members regard their local, as opposed to national, representatives. Even so, there is net dissatisfaction at local level also.

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that, in the workplace, your interests are adequately safeguarded by the Police Federation at each of the following levels?

	Very/fairly satisfied	Very/fairly dissatisfied	Net
At a local level	31%	47%	-17%
At a national level	14%	68%	-54%

When it comes to information, there clearly is more acknowledged engagement with the workplace and force level (JBB) than national level.

How informed, if at all, do each of the following keep you about matters that affect you/your work?

Workplace representative	
Very/fairly well	58%
Not very/not at all	40%

Force level Federation	
Very/fairly well	59%
Not very/not at all	39%

National level Federation	
Very/fairly well	38%
Not very/not at all	59%

We have quoted extensively from the Ipsos MORI survey, but it is important to note that its findings were consistent with the picture emerging from: the online consultation responses, regional consultations, focus groups, evidence sessions and other surveys. Many representatives and office holders shared some of the dissatisfaction expressed.

The Federation's elected representatives at all levels recognise and acknowledge the dissatisfaction of their members, but react to it in

Most of those stakeholders paint a negative picture of the Federation's impact and effectiveness, echoing the views coming from members

different ways. Some, including some local branches, argue powerfully that this makes the case for change. Some excuse it on the grounds that the dissatisfaction is inevitable at a time when the police service is facing the twin pressures of austerity and reform. There is a worrying tendency to blame someone else, reflecting the divisions in the Federation, on which we commented earlier.

In the final report, we will have more to say on the external pressures for change: negative media and political comment on the police and the Federation; the establishment of the College of Policing; and the move to a Pay Review Body for the police service. However, we are in no doubt that these changes alone require the Federation to operate differently, to adopt new strategies for influencing and to become more professional.

We will also describe in more detail the views of external stakeholders, police leadership, elected police commissioners, media and the government – all of whom have contributed to the review. Most of those stakeholders paint a negative picture of the Federation's impact and effectiveness, echoing the views coming from members.

There is acceptance and support for the importance of the Federation. There are some good relationships, especially at the local level. However, there is a widespread sense from outside the Federation of an organisation that has badly lost its way, failing to properly project its members' voice and serve their interests. These concerns are not simply related to recent events or a simple expression of a particular vested interest. It is a far deeper sense of a defensive, disjointed, and reactive organisation. Many external stakeholders have spoken to us in a brutally honest fashion. The clear message is one of necessary change. The expectation is that we will come up with substantive recommendations that address these concerns and issues.

At the time of writing, the events surrounding the former Chief Whip are also creating expectations of change from inside and outside the Federation. Members and representatives at all levels of the Federation are appalled at the damage this is doing to policing and are increasing the calls for change. The risk for the Federation, if it fails to reform itself is that it is reformed from outside. It was formed by the Government by legislation in 1919; presumably, if the public mood demands it, it could be changed by regulation in the same way. Local forces also have the ability to initiate and demand change. Indeed, our evidence has shown that while there is support for much of the work that the Federation does at a local level, there is also an expectation that change must come and soon.

We recognise that some of the messages will be hard to take for those who have devoted their time and effort to tirelessly representing their members. This is not a reflection on their very hard work.

We hope to persuade all involved in the Federation and its work, however, that out of this crisis of confidence can come a programme of reform which will make the Federation fit for the 21st century.

4. A programme for reform

Our final report will set out detailed proposals for a reformed Police Federation with suggestions for the timing and sequencing of the key steps we believe are necessary. In this progress report we look at the Federation's purpose and effectiveness and the key characteristics of reform.

Purpose

The Police Federation's current purpose, which is contained in the Police Act 1919, is a good starting point:

“For the purposes of enabling the *members* of the police forces of England and Wales to consider and bring to the notice of the police authorities and the Secretary of State all matters affecting *their* welfare and efficiency ... there shall be established ... an organisation to be called the Police Federation.” (italics inserted)

Although the language is somewhat arcane, the Federation exists for the welfare and efficiency of its members; and we endorse that original purpose. However, there is a question whether the purpose adequately reflects the need for a Federation which promotes the public interest as well as the interests of its members; and provides sufficient impetus to high standards of behaviour. We will therefore want to consider what it means to promote members' welfare and efficiency:

- As a staff association without the right to strike (which we do not see changing).
- When the Federation members are not simply contracted employees, but holders of the Office of Constable, with responsibilities to uphold the law and maintain public order in and out of work.
- As a body supported by public funds, with public profile/impact and consequent accountability.
- When its representatives should be expected, as a consequence, to uphold the highest standards of behaviour and ethics in and out of the public eye, and
- In an environment, where the Federation's impact will come from its expertise, influence and authority not simply through traditional representation and negotiation.

We believe that the Federation could be a much more powerful voice in setting the standards for policing and building public confidence in, and legitimacy for, the British model of policing. In fact, its legitimacy and, consequently, its ability to serve its members depend on it doing so. It is a critical institution mediating between its members, policing administration, and the general public. The Police Federation serves its members directly but there is a need to acknowledge that this requires a sense of wider authority and credibility: legitimacy.

Effectiveness

In the course of our work, we have taken views from a range of experts in what makes for effectiveness in representation bodies; and we will seek to present an assessment of the Federation's current effectiveness, looking particularly at:

- The quality of the local **representation** of members, particularly at times of crisis and difficulty, and of the **advice** and **services** specifically designed to promote officers' welfare and wellbeing.
- Members' **satisfaction** and **engagement**, on which we have already presented some of the evidence in this report.
- The extent to which the Federation **sets the agenda** in putting issues concerning its members in the police and policing domain while influencing public debates on policing in a positive fashion.
- Financial accountability, including the current model of budget holding, income from services and value for money from subscription levels, and
- The use of **'hard'** and **'soft'** power: in other words how the Federation uses evidence, expertise, relationship and high quality communications to achieve desired outcomes; and the use of 'power' as a last resort.

There are some strengths emerging from the evidence. We have heard good examples of the impact of local representatives, but the standard is variable. Some of the local representation of police officers in difficulty is outstanding and generally valued by the members. There is a concern that the interests of officers who are categorised in law as having 'protected characteristics' are not sufficiently well articulated and represented within the Federation's structures. It is concerning that there are a variety of associations who have felt the need to organise outside of the Federation, notwithstanding the fact that many have a slightly different focus and remit. It has become clear that, while police forces are becoming more diverse, the Police Federation is lagging behind.

Despite the very difficult national environment, the national leadership has had more positive influence and input on issues like pensions than the members recognise. But there has been a serious failure to communicate what has been achieved and why more was not possible. There are institutional issues concerning access to expertise, governance, and the capacity of the leadership to initiate and implement change in the current structure.

We are concerned about the model of funding, which lacks transparency and separates budgets and reserves in many different accounts. The present funding model looks inefficient and may not provide the best value

There is a responsibility to demonstrate good value for money, budgets that are efficiently managed, and the impact for members of all expenditures that are made

for the subscription. While members and the forces that employ them face enormous financial pressures, there is a responsibility to demonstrate good value for money, budgets that are efficiently managed, and the impact for members of all expenditures that are made. It is especially concerning that all income is not transparently accounted for and decisions made in one part of the organisation have to be funded by another. This is bad practice. We do acknowledge, however, the importance of branch autonomy.

There is a major challenge for the Federation to increase its impact and authority nationally and locally, while regaining and maintaining confidence of its members. It will be a central theme of our report. We do not think some of the behaviours exhibited at past annual conferences or during the controversy surrounding the former Chief Whip favour the Federation or its members' cause in any way.

Key characteristics of an effective Police Federation

We have identified a number of key characteristics we believe should provide the foundation for an effective and purposeful Police Federation. These characteristics have emerged from consideration of the range of evidence, analysis of the core purpose and of an effective representative organisation as outlined above.

They are intended as a mirror to be held up to the existing organisation. Our aim will be to propose a Federation which is:

- **Exemplary in standards of behaviour and ethics.** This should govern both relations within the organisation and with external stakeholders. Probity and integrity are essential. However, more than that is required: mutual respect, inclusiveness, and openness as a foundation to earned trust. It is not simply what the Police Federation does that is important, but also how it goes about its business. We do not think that the Federation consistently measures up to these standards at present. In fact, we have found numerous instances, in the public domain and not, where it has fallen well short.
- **Strong in its capacity to align the professional interests of police officers and the public interest in a legitimate and effective system of law and order.** When those interests are in danger of diverging, the Federation should be willing and able to act in a way that realigns them. The Federation has the opportunity to be the authoritative voice of rank and file police officers as the police service changes over coming years. However, if it takes the easy route of defensiveness, resistance and politicisation then it will marginalise itself even further. Its members' voice and their understanding will be lost, their professional needs muffled, and public, police service and Police Federation members will lose out as a result. In extremis, the standing of the service suffers and the work of police officers becomes more challenging on a day-to-day basis. That is what we mean by diverging alignment and it is damaging.
- **Accountable.** We are clear that the Police Federation is owned by all of its members and is accountable to the public for reasons

we have identified. All representatives and employees act on their behalf and in their ultimate interests. There is an urgent need for this to be more than a transactional relationship, defined instead through engagement and dialogue with effective voice and decision taking mechanisms. Ultimately, the mechanisms of governance and lines of accountability need to be clear. Two way communications must be transformed. Members should have all information to which they are entitled and should be able to act upon it following due process. There should be reciprocal accountability between local and national levels of the organisation whilst both levels are jointly accountable to the public and members through its statutory purpose.

- **Unified and coherent.** This requires effective decision-making structures and internal mechanisms which resolve differences within the organisation and enable ‘one voice’ to be heard in the external environment. This applies between JBBs and the JCC, across the ranks, and between the membership and the organisation at both local and national level. Decisions should be taken at the relevant level and involve all relevant stakeholders.
- **Professional and expert** representatives throughout the organisation should have an understanding of their role and the context in which they operate and be assisted in their performance. Their skills should be accredited, recognised, and developed over time and they should be accountable on that basis. Weak performance should be confronted and dealt with.
- **Transparent.** In order for every member to be able to understand how their subscriptions are used and decisions are taken on their behalf, they need clear information. This includes information on expenses, votes taken, accounts, expenditure, reserves, publication of key papers (unless there is genuine sensitivity), and public policy positions that affect them. When decisions are taken, the rationale should be explained clearly. The present lack of transparency breeds suspicion, even when there is nothing to be suspicious about. The present level of suspicion about the national level representatives and the ‘Leatherhead culture’ is particularly noteworthy.
- **Authoritative and credible.** This rests on expertise, evidence and analysis. Authority and credibility emerge from continuous engagement which is lacking. This applies at the local level, with national decision-makers and stakeholders, and between all levels of the organisation. Credibility and authority have to be based on evidence, strategic awareness, understanding the operational and public policy environment, analysis and two-way communication. It is not enough to just project; the Police Federation also needs to converse with key external stakeholders and decision-makers on the basis of sound evidence and real insight. This applies to the determination of its members’ terms and conditions of employment as well as to wider policing issues. At a basic level, it is inconceivable that effective engagement is possible without both local branches and the national Federation having the ability to communicate with every

member. A national database of the membership is essential and should not need to await our final report. However, our final recommendations will be far deeper and broader than this basic and necessary reform.

- **Imbued with an ‘every member counts’ ethos.** From the core representative and support function, to elected representation, to external influence and engagement, the voice of every member should be heard and every member should receive exceptional representation. This includes all ranks, officers with ‘protected characteristics’, all forces and regions (including Wales which is a nation and has its own devolved administration as, indeed, does London), and all particular issues that relate to different lengths of service. We will have some more to say in our final report about the need for the Federation’s representation to be more diverse and to represent more closely the growing diversity of police officers.
- **Capable of changing structures, behaviours, and strategies when necessary.** A strong organisation has the capacity to change when its current trajectory is the wrong one. This change can sometimes be fundamental. The Police Federation is still constructed around local and national structures that are almost a century old. On numerous occasions there have been opportunities to change that have not been taken. Effectiveness relies on a degree of flexibility. This matters at the structural, behavioural, and strategic levels. In a fast-moving, rapidly changing media, political and policing environment, this impacts effectiveness in fulfilling the core purpose: defending the welfare of members and contributing to efficiency in their roles.

In our final report, we are going to address a number of issues linked to these ‘key characteristics’ and this will include: behaviour and ethics; how trust is enhanced throughout the organisation and with those whom it seeks to influence externally; how the organisation could and should project a persuasive and credible rank-and-file voice in debates about the future of policing; the representational structure’s effectiveness and efficiency; the rank structure; widening participation in elections to enhance accountability; more transparent financial management; and a much better flow of relevant communications.

5. Indicative timetable and next steps

Our purpose in this progress report has been to give a clear idea of the work we have done so far and our emerging thinking. Whilst the IR Panel do not intend to open a further consultation, if there are concrete suggestions for recommendations based on the above that have not already been submitted in written evidence they can be sent to independentreview@rsa.org.uk.

Our next steps are:

End October 2013

First model for Police Federation reform considered by Panel meeting 7

Middle November 2013

Final evidence review completed

Panel meeting 8 to agree final reform package

December 2013

First draft of final report completed and agreed at Panel meeting 9

Mid-January 2014

Panel meeting 10 signs off final report

Report passed to JCC and published

6. Final comments

We would encourage all interested parties to read this report which is a staging post on the journey to our final report. We encourage those who lead the Federation at national and local level to keep an open mind and to begin to show the leadership which will be needed in responding to the overwhelming need for change articulated by the Federation's own members and the wider world. We want not only to recommend reform but also to see it implemented. That is what will ultimately ensure that the Police Federation is an effective staff association acting in all its members' best interests, and representing all that is best in policing.

Appendix

Panel members

- **Sir David Normington GCB** – a former home office permanent secretary, and current First Civil Service Commissioner and Commissioner for Public Appointments (Chair)
- **Sir Denis O'Connor CBE QPM** – former Chief Inspector of Constabulary, he has extensive policing experience at a senior command level and experience of the inter-relationship between all ranks and policing bodies
- **Professor Linda Dickens MBE** – Professor of Industrial Relations at the University of Warwick with an acknowledged and extensive record of academic research in the field of management and employment relations
- **Sir Brendan Barber** – former General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress (TUC) who retired last year. He brings extensive experience of representing employees and leading a national trade union organisation
- **Kathryn Kane OBE** – former local Chair of Merseyside in the Police Federation who will be able to advise on Federation representation at both a force and regional level
- **Dr Neil Bentley** – CBI Deputy Director General and Chief Operating Officer, he has an in depth knowledge of the business community and a background in industrial relations and equality & diversity

Secretariat

- **Anthony Painter** – Director of the Police Federation Independent Review
- **Brhmie Balaram** – Researcher
- **Thomas Hauschildt** – Coordinator

Terms of Reference

To conduct an independent review of the Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW). The Review will consider whether changes are required to any aspect of the Police Federation's operation or structure in order to ensure that it continues to promote the public good as well as meeting its statutory obligation to represent the interests and welfare of its members and the efficiency of the police service.

The Review will consider, in particular, the degree to which improvements are necessary to ensure the PFEW:

- 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.

The Review will engage openly with all stakeholders and interested parties, providing opportunities to submit evidence and proposals and to set out views relevant to its remit.

The Review will deliver its recommendations to the Joint Central Committee of the Police Federation of England and Wales, having regard for:

- Value for money in respect of police officers' subscriptions to the PFEW.
- The unique position and responsibilities of the Office of Constable.
- The importance of enhancing public confidence in policing.
- The impact of its recommendations upon equality and diversity
- Transparency of decision making and the subsequent action taken.

The Review will detail its findings and recommendations in a report by January 2014. Should the review conclude that changes are required to the operation or structure of the Federation, recommendations should be set out in such a way as to allow for a realistic phased introduction from May 2014.

Web address

www.thersa.org/policefedreview

Email address

independentreview@rsa.org.uk

Twitter

@polfedreview

Ipsos MORI survey technical details

- Members of the Police Federation were sent an open survey-link to complete. The RSA were responsible for co-ordinating links via Police Federation regional co-ordinators. At the start of the survey respondents are asked to confirm that they were members of the Police Federation. Those who said that they were not members were routed out of the survey. Respondents were also asked a series of questions about their service in the police force. This included their length of service, rank and their force.
- Results are based on 13,456 online survey responses, 1,212 of which were partially completed. Figures are expressed in

percentage terms. Where they do not sum exactly to 100%, this will be due to computer rounding or multiple response answers. The number of respondents completing each question is expressed throughout.

- Fieldwork was conducted between 2–20 September 2013.
- It is important to note that the survey is neither a ballot of all members nor a survey encompassing a pure randomly selected sample of Federation members (which 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 wide-spread gauge of opinions amongst over 12,000 Police Federation members, with significant coverage across ranks and forces.

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 2013

www.thersa.org
