



SCOTTISH POLICE FEDERATION

Established by Act of Parliament

ILEC 2006 USA

SESSION 1 – Key Issues

1. Police Pay

Police pay in the UK is linked to a survey commissioned by the Police Negotiating Board (PNB) entitled 'Pay Awards for Non-Manual Employees outside Public Services Sector'. The survey measures pay movements to 7 June each year and police pay is linked to median increase in total pay. This showed a 3 per cent increase to 7 June 2006. For the first time in 28 years, the 'employer's side' of the PNB refused to agree to award the police the product of this index.

In 1978 Edmund-Davies Committee of Inquiry on the Police, said in its Report on Negotiating Pay and Machinery: "In common with all those who submitted evidence for our consideration, this Committee is satisfied that the absence of the right to strike is a serious deprivation for any worker. It is essential that the police should not suffer in pay because they are deprived of the right to strike, and that it should be put beyond doubt that they are being paid fairly."

This pay dispute goes to independent arbitration on 18 October 2006.

2. Police should prevent crime and disorder deal with all crimes and offences and target persistent offenders.

Policing activity is necessarily complex and varied but no other duties or responsibilities should be carried out to the detriment of these primary objectives. Government must understand that every new task requires resources and that those resources cannot continually be taken from street level strength.

'Non-attendant policies' and 'managing demand' favoured by senior officers and government has been detrimental to public confidence in the police. By refusing to send officers when requested or when a crime or offence is deemed 'too minor', or taking many hours or even days to attend, the public stop reporting minor crime and those who commit such crimes are not discouraged from doing so.

A disproportionate amount of crime is committed by relatively few people. Targeting such individuals and ensuring they are brought before courts would alleviate public suffering and reduce offences.

3. Police should be accountable for crime and disorder with detailed statistical information for local areas being published regularly and Divisional Commanders being open to question about performance.

Frontline police officers are 'held to account' by members of the public everyday in life. They hear justifiable complaints from people that it has taken too long for them to respond to a call for assistance or that they did not attend at all or that they are never around when there is trouble. Constables, sergeants and inspectors know that the major reason for this unhappy situation is that there is a shortage of police officers to meet public demand. From higher up the rank structure we rarely hear anything other than "*it's not just about numbers, that's too simplistic*".

The public have a right to know about policing, crime and disorder in their area. Detailed statistical information would assist in ensuring appropriate resources are allocated to areas of need and ensure meaningful accountability.

Divisional Commanders should be held accountable and made to explain police performance in their area. If the reason for poor performance is a lack of resources (as it often is) then they would be forced to say so.

4. There should be a public enquiry into police duties, officer numbers, force structure and alternatives to traditional policing.

For years the Scottish Police Federation has recognized a need for a public enquiry into policing. Forty six years after the last one, it is not before time.

New duties brought about by new legislation and an ever increasing demand for policing by the public has Scottish Police Forces stretched to and in some cases beyond their limits. While we have more police officers than ever before we still cannot cope with the demand.

There are eight geographical police forces in Scotland and politicians and senior officers periodically contemplate re-drawing the lines on the map. We would like this matter settled and bottom line for us is that we will not be opposed to change providing there is a proven case that it will improve quality of service to the public and there is no detriment to the employment conditions of our members.

Finally, as will be addressed elsewhere at this meeting, we have an expansion of quasi-policing and we believe this should be evaluated before it goes it further.