



# **Prison Service Pay Review Body**

**Fourth Report**  
on  
**Northern Ireland**  
2006

*Chair: Jerry Cope*



# **Prison Service Pay Review Body**

**Fourth Report**  
on  
**Northern Ireland**  
2006

*Chair: Jerry Cope*

**Presented to Parliament by the  
Prime Minister and the Secretary of State  
for Northern Ireland  
March 2006**



# **Prison Service Pay Review Body**

**Fourth Report**  
on  
**Northern Ireland**  
2006

*Chair: Jerry Cope*

**Presented to Parliament by the  
Prime Minister and the Secretary of State  
for Northern Ireland  
March 2006**

**© Crown Copyright 2006**

The text in this document (excluding the Royal Arms and departmental logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.

Any enquiries relating to the copyright in this document should be addressed to The Licensing Division, HMSO, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ. Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: [licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

The current membership of the  
**Prison Service Pay Review Body**

is

Jerry Cope (*Chair*)

Beryl Brewer

Derek Bourn

Ray Coughlin

Peter Heard

Frank Horisk

Sarah Murray

Dr Peter Riach

Ann Robinson

Peter Tett

Beryl Brewer acts informally as deputy chair if required.

The secretariat is provided by the  
Office of Manpower Economics

---

## Contents

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Summary</i>		vii
<i>Glossary of Terms</i>		ix
<i>Northern Ireland Prison Service and our remit groups</i>		x
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>		<b>1</b>
Our role and terms of reference	1.1	1
Remit letter	1.3	1
Outcome of our last report	1.4	1
Evidence base	1.6	2
Written and oral evidence	1.7	2
Visits to prison establishments	1.9	2
Our report	1.10	2
<b>Chapter 2: Background to our review</b>		<b>3</b>
Primary considerations	2.1	3
Strategic Development Programme	2.4	3
Security situation	2.10	4
Recruitment and retention	2.12	5
The economic context	2.14	5
Financial position and affordability	2.17	6
<b>Chapter 3: Remit, directions and recommendations</b>		<b>7</b>
Introduction	3.1	7
Basic pay award	3.3	7
Senior and principal officer pay on promotion	3.16	9

---

Scale minima and maxima	3.20	10
Northern Ireland Prison Service payment	3.24	11
Performance pay	3.31	12
Required hours addition	3.35	13
Other allowances	3.39	13
Night custody officers	3.41	14
Overall cost of our recommendations	3.43	14
<b>Chapter 4: Final comments</b>		<b>15</b>
<b>Appendices</b>		
A: Standing terms of reference		17
B: Remit letter		19
C: Prison Service Agency's weighting of performance targets		23
D: Current and recommended pay levels		25
E: Current and recommended allowances		29



---

## **Prison Service Pay Review Body Fourth Report on Northern Ireland: Summary**

### **Key recommendations for 1 April 2006**

- Unless otherwise specified, a consolidated increase in basic pay of 2 per cent through spinal progression, for all remit group staff;
- To begin to narrow the gap between senior officers and principal officers who received an increase of 10 per cent on promotion and more experienced colleagues in the grade, senior and principal officers on spine points 172 and 185 should move up one spine point in addition to the basic award of 2 per cent; those on spine points 175 and 191 should receive an award of 1.5 per cent;
- An increase of four points to all pay range minima and maxima with the exception of auxiliary and night patrol officer grades, where range minima remain unchanged but the maxima increase by 6 points;
- Consolidation of the Northern Ireland Prison Service (NIPS) payment for governor grades, at its 2005 value, subject to the Prison Officers' Association (POA) and the Prison Governors Association (PGA) accepting the conditions set out by the Prison Service Agency (PSA);
- An unconsolidated performance award for all remit staff of up to 1 per cent and unconsolidated individual performance awards for governors of 4 per cent for a box one mark; 3 per cent for a box two mark; and 2 per cent for a box three mark.

### **Introduction** *(Chapter 1)*

Our role under our standing terms of reference is to make pay recommendations each year that support the Prison Service's ability to recruit, retain and motivate staff within our remit. We are also required to respond to specific directions set out in the remit letter from the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. For this report, we examined evidence on recruitment, retention, morale and motivation and financial and economic considerations. We considered substantial written submissions from each of the parties, took oral evidence from them to discuss their evidence in greater detail and visited Maghaberry and Magilligan prisons to meet staff in our remit group and improve our understanding of their work and working environment.

### **Background** *(Chapter 2)*

As in previous years, our remit letter emphasised that our pay recommendations should be consistent with reducing the Cost Per Prisoner Place (CPPP) and with the Government's modernisation agenda and pay strategy. This year we were told that the Service had launched a Strategic Development Programme which offered the prospect of pay reform within a strategic framework. The programme is a major undertaking and will form part of the Prison Service's contribution to the next spending review in 2007. We welcome these efforts to modernise the pay system; we would like to see the pay and grading review address the principles we set out in our 2005 report. These include a clear understanding of what constitutes consolidated or unconsolidated pay; an appropriate grading structure linked to appropriate pay levels and differentials; a consideration of performance or competence based pay; and a consistent methodology for implementing awards. We also consider it appropriate for the pay and grading review to examine the residual link with the England and Wales system. We very much welcome improving industrial relations, which provides a positive environment for negotiations on reform.

---

The evidence indicated a continuing stable staffing position with low turnover rates, supported, in the view of the PSA, by pay levels that are high relative to other areas of the Northern Ireland economy. We note the POA's view that current pay levels have been achieved as a result of improved performance and efficiency savings. Data on the number of attacks outside work showed a decline over the last three years; nevertheless, the real and perceived threat to staff and their families remains a major concern. We recognise the pressures on the PSA to reduce the CPPP and to manage rising prison populations through the more efficient and effective use of staff. We are also aware of the challenges posed by a small estate, which reduces the scope for making savings through economies of scale, and of managing the separated regime at Maghaberry. The economic and management evidence provided by the Government pointed to low and stable inflation. We balanced all these considerations in reaching our recommendations.

### **Remit, directions and recommendations** (*Chapter 3*)

The PSA proposed a low award which varied by grade. The staff associations proposed a higher, across the board award, partly to restore what they saw as lost ground. In light of the evidence on recruitment and retention, affordability and wider economic considerations we did not consider either of these proposals to be appropriate. Against the backdrop of the Strategic Development Programme we considered that a straightforward across the board award was appropriate for this year. We recommended changes to spine point minima and maxima so that awards will be consolidated.

We were asked to consider the position of experienced senior and principal officers whose pay had been overtaken by that of more junior colleagues who had received a 10 per cent pay rise on promotion. Our recommendation is intended to begin to narrow the pay gap. In our view, the issue should be addressed further as part of the pay and grading review.

In response to a proposal from the PSA, we recommended the consolidation of the NIPS payment for governor grades on the understanding that all parties agree to the conditions set out by the PSA. Given the prospects for pay reform, we recommended, for this year, the continuation of the current arrangements for Service wide performance pay for all staff and the personal and establishment based performance pay for governor grades. Finally, we again recommended that specialist allowances should be frozen except for dog grooming where the allowance relates to actual cost and should be updated by 3.2 per cent in line with the relevant index.

Our recommendations this year would add some £1½m or 2.1 per cent to the paybill.

### **Final comments** (*Chapter 4*)

We look forward to the outcome of the pay and grading review and to proposals being brought to us next year for a pay reform package that has the agreement of all parties. We stand ready to assist the parties in the process in any way that they agree would be helpful.

---

## Glossary of Terms

CPPP	cost per prisoner place
CPI	consumer prices index
NIO	Northern Ireland Office
NIPS	Northern Ireland Prison Service
OME	Office of Manpower Economics
PGA	Prison Governors Association
POA	Prison Officers' Association
PSA	Prison Service Agency
PSPRB	Prison Service Pay Review Body
RHA	required hours addition
RPI	retail prices index
RPIX	retail prices index excluding mortgage interest payments

---

## The Prison Service in Northern Ireland and our remit groups

The Northern Ireland Prison Service, through its staff, aims to serve the community by keeping in secure, safe and humane custody those committed by the courts, and by working with prisoners and with other organisations, seeks to reduce the risk of re-offending; and in so doing protect the public and contribute to peace and stability in Northern Ireland.

It has three operational establishments – one of which accommodates male young offenders and female prisoners.

It had a prison population on 30 January 2006 of 1,310.

It had paybill costs of some £82 million in 2004-2005, of which nearly £71 million related to our remit groups.

It had a workforce of 2,061 staff at the end of December 2005, including staff outside our remit groups as well as those within. The composition of our remit groups is shown below.

### Our remit groups in Northern Ireland, as at 31 December 2005

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Staff in post<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>%</i>
Governor grades	34	2.1
Officer grades <sup>2</sup>	1,601	97.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,635</b>	<b>100</b>

<sup>1</sup> Full time equivalents

<sup>2</sup> Includes night patrol officer, night custody officer and auxiliary grades.

*Source: Latest available data from Northern Ireland Prison Service Agency.*

---

## Chapter 1: Introduction

**Our role and terms of reference** 1.1 This is our fourth report as an independent Pay Review Body for Prison Service staff within our remit in Northern Ireland. We report separately for England and Wales. Our remit does not apply to Scotland where separate pay negotiating arrangements apply.

1.2 Our core task under our standing terms of reference, reproduced at Appendix A, is to recommend rates of pay that are fair and appropriate in the light of the evidence presented to us, and to address the additional directions contained in the remit letter from the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland (reproduced at Appendix B).

**Remit letter** 1.3 In his remit letter for this report, as in previous years, the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland emphasised the need for an award that was consistent with reducing the Cost Per Prisoner Place (CPPP) and with the Government's modernisation agenda. This year, he advised us also that the Northern Ireland Prison Service had launched a comprehensive Strategic Development Programme, which will examine different aspects of the Service. It is the intention that the Programme will deliver significant changes to the current pay and grading structure, though not within the timescale for this report. For 1 April 2006, therefore, the remit letter asked us to consider realistic and affordable basic pay levels for remit group staff to recruit, retain and motivate them within the context of the economic and market factors in which the Service operates. We were also asked to:

- Consider the starting pay and maxima of each pay range and current differentials;
- Review the overlap between principal officer and governor 5 grades;
- Take account of the need for an element of non-consolidation to stabilise baseline costs for future years;
- Take account of the reform and modernisation agenda which emphasises a link between pay and performance;
- Consider whether the NIPS payment for governor grades should be consolidated; and
- Consider whether an RHA is appropriate for governor grades to replace on call duty allowances.

Our detailed response to the remit letter is set out in Chapter 3.

**Outcome of our last report<sup>1</sup>** 1.4 In our 2005 report we recommended:

- An increase in basic pay for all remit group staff of 2 per cent through consolidated spinal progression;
- The consolidation of the 2004 unconsolidated award for longer serving prison officers;
- A 2 per cent increase to range minima and maxima;

---

<sup>1</sup> Previous reports are published on the web site of the Office of Manpower Economics: [www.ome.uk.com](http://www.ome.uk.com)

- An unconsolidated service wide performance award of 1 per cent subject to targets being fully met;
- An increase in the value of unconsolidated performance awards for governor grade staff; and
- An increase in the value of the unconsolidated NIPS payment for governor grades.

1.5 Our recommendations were accepted by the Government and implemented in full. In making our recommendations, we commented on the need for a clearer understanding, shared by all the parties, of the way in which the pay system should operate in the context of an overall staffing strategy. We welcome, therefore, the remit letter's reference to the prospect of reform of the pay system. We return to this theme in Chapter 2.

**Evidence base** 1.6 As we have emphasised in previous reports, our recommendations and advice each year are based on our independent judgement of all the evidence available to us. This includes written and oral submissions made to us by the Prison Service Agency<sup>2</sup> (PSA) and the staff associations and information received from our visits to prison establishments. We continue to appreciate the open and constructive way in which we are able to conduct discussions for our reviews with all of the interested parties.

**Written and oral evidence** 1.7 We were provided with our remit letter for this review in early August and requested written submissions in response from the interested parties for mid September. We are grateful for the detailed and timely written submissions provided to us.

1.8 We received oral evidence from Shaun Woodward MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State and Robin Masefield, Director General of the Northern Ireland Prison Service with other officials of the PSA. We also met, separately, representatives of the staff associations led by Gerry McAleer for the Prison Governors Association (PGA), and Finlay Spratt for the Prison Officers' Association (POA) which represents some governors as well as officers and other grades.

**Visits to prison establishments** 1.9 Each year we visit prison establishments in Northern Ireland. In preparation for this report we visited Maghaberry and Magilligan. These visits are an essential part of our work. They enable us to meet members of our remit group across all grades, to see them in their working environment and to gain a better understanding of the nature of the job. We also meet local staff association representatives. The views expressed to us on visits provide us with an additional insight to the evidence that is placed before us each year. Equally, the visits give us an opportunity to explain our work to our remit group and the importance of the evidence base for our recommendations. We are very grateful to everyone involved in organising or taking part in visits and we continue to be impressed by the high level of professionalism we see throughout the Service.

**Our report** 1.10 In Chapter 2, we set out the background to our deliberations including the Strategic Development Programme and prospects for pay reform, the staffing position and the security environment. In line with our terms of reference we also consider specific affordability issues relating to the Northern Ireland Prison Service and wider economic considerations.

1.11 Our secretariat is provided by the Office of Manpower Economics (OME). We are grateful to them and to other OME staff for their support.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Northern Ireland Prison Service is an executive agency of the Northern Ireland Office. For the purposes of this report, its evidence to us is attributed to the "Prison Service Agency (PSA)", leaving references to the "Prison Service" to apply to the Northern Ireland Prison Service more generally.

---

## Chapter 2: Background to our review

### Primary considerations

2.1 As we noted in Chapter 1, the Secretary of State's remit letter for this review emphasised that our pay recommendations should be consistent with reducing the CPPP and with the Government's modernisation agenda and pay strategy. The CPPP in Northern Ireland is high relative to England and Wales. The PSA told us that there were many reasons for this arising from the particular circumstances of Northern Ireland, including the security position, and, given the small estate, the inability to benefit from economies of scale. Possibly in consequence there is a higher ratio of basic grade prison officers to prisoners; 60 per cent of those officers being at their pay range maximum (compared with 39 per cent of basic grade officers in England and Wales) and a higher pay maximum for prison officers in Northern Ireland.

2.2 We note in this context that the Hamill Report<sup>3</sup> concluded that the size of the prison estate, and having different types of prison regime encompassed within Maghaberry prison, both impacted on the CPPP. We also note the POA's view of the extent to which improvements in pay and conditions have been negotiated in return for, and funded by, improved performance and efficiencies.

2.3 The remit letter referred to the Prison Service's Strategic Development Programme. This offers the prospect of pay reform within a strategic framework, which we have urged in earlier reports. In this chapter, we consider the Strategic Development Programme and the prospects for pay reform, before going on to look at security, staffing, wider economic considerations and affordability.

### Strategic Development Programme

2.4 In their evidence to us, the PSA stressed that the Service needed to be more efficient and effective. This requires management, staff and their representatives to work together on a development programme or "blue print" for the Service for the next 10 to 15 years. The Agency told us that employee relations had improved in the period since our last report and that they hoped to build on this. A number of work strands began in the summer of 2005, stimulated by the Hamill Report and building on earlier work, covering prison population projections, estates strategy, the approach to contestability, options for the future provision of escort services and pay and grading, all of which were expected to impact on costs over time. The PSA informed us that the future staffing strategy continued to centre on managing increasing prisoner numbers through delivering more efficient working patterns and practices. Prison officers would focus on professional core work characterised by considerable prisoner engagement and a high level of responsibility, not only for security and safety but also for prisoner rehabilitation and resettlement. Support grade staff would be employed to perform roles involving lower levels of prisoner responsibility. There would be an increased emphasis on training and development of staff. The PSA aimed to achieve any necessary reductions in staff through voluntary redundancy, for which some funds had been earmarked.

2.5 In our 2005 report we recommended rates of pay for two new categories of staff: prisoner custody officers, who would carry out court/escort work for magistrates courts; and night custody officers who would replace some prison officers on night duty. Eighty night custody officers are now in post and we consider them in Chapter 3. While a successful recruitment campaign for prisoner custody officers was run in 2004, no appointments were made pending a reappraisal of the delivery of the function. Work in this area now falls under the umbrella of the Strategic Development Programme.

---

<sup>3</sup> Review of the Northern Ireland Prison Service Efficiency Programme; March 2005.

2.6 The Strategic Development Programme is clearly a significant undertaking in which many of the individual elements are interdependent. In effect, it will form the basis of the Service's contribution to the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007. The PSA advised us that it intended to make progress on pay and grading reform as part of the Programme with the overall aim of achieving a pay and grading structure that related better to the responsibilities and risks associated with different areas of work. However, proposals were not sufficiently advanced to ask us to make recommendations for 1 April 2006.

2.7 Neither the POA nor the PGA raised the issue of pay reform in their written evidence. We are aware, however, from oral evidence and from the discussions we held during our visit to Northern Ireland that, while there is a general acknowledgement of improving industrial relations, the staff associations have been somewhat frustrated at the pace of progress on pay and grading issues. The POA and PGA told us that they stood ready to engage constructively with the PSA in discussions on reform. We expect to see real progress in 2006 and urge the PSA to ensure that both the POA and the PGA are fully engaged on issues that affect their respective memberships.

2.8 In our 2005 report, we set out the principles that we considered should be addressed in any discussions between the parties on the pay system and how it should operate. We believe that a number of these principles are relevant to the work on the pay and grading structure being undertaken as part of the Strategic Development Programme. These are:

- A clear understanding of what should constitute consolidated pay and, where elements are to be unconsolidated, the basis on which they should be handled from year to year;
- Appropriate basic pay levels in conjunction with effective arrangements to reward achievement for governor and uniformed grades;
- Pay differentials which reflect an appropriate grading structure;
- Performance or competence based arrangements under which staff can move up their pay ranges;
- A consistent methodology for implementing general annual awards which avoids the constraints on the size of awards associated with spinal progression; and
- The elimination of any dependence on residual links with the pay system for the Prison Service for England and Wales, which itself remains in need of reform.

2.9 This list is not intended to be exclusive. Work under the Strategic Development Programme may identify other issues, for example, the grade structure at middle and senior management and the current service wide performance pay arrangements.

### **Security situation**

2.10 We know from our visits that the security situation continues to be a concern for staff and their families. This was reflected in the evidence from the staff associations. The POA in particular detailed the financial and emotional cost to their members of previous security breaches and of living with actual or perceived threats to them or their family. The PSA provided statistics on attacks on prison officers outside of work from 1 January 2003 to 11 November 2005. These figures showed a welcome decline in incidents over the period. In 2003 there were 36 attacks on officers, falling to 31 in 2004 and 10 in the first ten months of 2005. External threats similarly fell from 11 in 2003 to four in 2004 and two in 2005. Despite these statistics, staff and their representatives continue to stress that security issues represent a material difference between the Northern Ireland and the England and Wales Services. This was

acknowledged by the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State in oral evidence who praised staff for their handling of the generic, and sometimes specific, threats against them. He concluded that the working environment found in England and Wales was unlikely to be replicated in Northern Ireland in the short term, although progress was being made towards this.

2.11 In our visits to Maghaberry we noted the operational demands of maintaining separated houses compared with those of the remainder of the accommodation, and the different approaches to offender management that each required. We were told that officers are required to switch between the two regimes on an approximately two yearly basis, taking on the differing offender management approaches this entailed.

### **Recruitment and retention**

2.12 As we have noted in previous years, the PSA does not have recruitment or retention difficulties in the usual sense. The impact of the last redundancy programme, which ran between 1999 and 2001, reduced the number of officers over 50 years of age. Natural wastage is low and there is limited scope to achieve paybill savings by recruiting new staff at lower salary levels. In the view of the PSA, one of the factors supporting retention was levels of pay that are high relative to elsewhere in the Northern Ireland economy.

2.13 The POA acknowledged the lack of recruitment and retention problems. In their view, however, the stability of the work force had been a positive constant feature of the Northern Ireland Service for a considerable period and they saw no reason why the recruitment and retention position should be a determinant of the level of the award. They argued that the loyalty of their members to the Prison Service over many difficult years should be rewarded.

### **The economic context**

2.14 The PSA's written submission included the Government's evidence on the general economic context, which is common to all public sector pay review bodies. It emphasised the Government's desire to ensure that resources were focused on front line service delivery and pointed to the availability of a number of economic indicators relevant to the work of review bodies including the retail prices index (RPI), retail prices excluding mortgage interest payments (RPIX) and the consumer prices index (CPI) against which the Government sets its inflation target. The Government's economic evidence suggested that the emphasis should be placed on underlying inflation trends rather than single month figures. It expected the CPI rate, which then stood at 2.3 per cent, to return to the target rate of 2 per cent by mid 2006 and RPI to fall in 2005-06 and 2006-07 and rise again in 2007-08 before remaining constant.

2.15 The Chancellor of the Exchequer wrote to each of the Chairs of the review bodies in November 2005 drawing attention to the impact of oil prices on the CPI inflation rate, which then stood at 2.3 per cent. He said that he expected this effect to be temporary and repeated the view that the CPI measure should return to target in 2006. He also suggested that this was the inflation rate that review bodies should bear in mind when making their recommendations on pay. The POA, in response to the Chancellor's letter, took the view that it was inappropriate to seek to ignore the impact of particular components of the index, particularly as high fuel prices directly affected its members. We note that inflation data for December 2005 showed the indices converging with CPI and RPIX at 2 per cent and RPI at 2.2 per cent.

2.16 Whole economy average earnings for the UK grew by 3.4 per cent, or 3.8 per cent after excluding bonuses, in the three months to November 2005. Public sector earnings growth including bonuses in the three months to November 2005 was 4.1 per cent and private sector earnings growth 3.3 per cent. The median level of settlements remained around 3 per cent. The Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings indicated that, in the year to April 2005, median gross weekly earnings for full-time adults in Northern Ireland increased by 3.8 per cent compared to 2.8 per cent in the UK as a whole.

**Financial position and affordability**

2.17 The PSA drew attention to the Government's overall position on the affordability of pay rises within the tight funding available from the 2004 Spending Review. Against this backdrop, the PSA proposed an award that they estimated would add 2.3 per cent to the in-year paybill (though we estimate that the figure would be 1.9 per cent when the cost of residual guarantees arising from the agreement that established the current pay system was excluded) with an element that was unconsolidated to contain base line costs for future years.

2.18 We take account of all these various considerations, and comment further on them, in reaching our recommendations, which are set out in Chapter 3.

---

## Chapter 3: Remit, directions and recommendations

**Introduction** 3.1 In this chapter we consider each of the issues on which our advice has been sought for the twelve months beginning 1 April 2006, as set out in our remit letter from the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. As we noted in Chapter 2, the remit letter advised us of the launch of the Northern Ireland Prison Service's comprehensive Strategic Development Programme which was expected to deliver significant changes to the pay and grading structure for our remit groups. The PSA advised us that work under the Programme was unlikely to reach a conclusion in sufficient time for us to make recommendations against the resulting structures in this report. We were invited, therefore, to make recommendations against the current system for a one-year award with effect from 1 April 2006.

3.2 In reaching our recommendations, we have taken account of the primary considerations set out in the remit letter that the award should be consistent with reducing the CPPP and with the Government's modernisation agenda. We have also taken account of the change programme in Northern Ireland and the need to maintain the improving employee relations and staff morale necessary to support that agenda.

**Basic pay award** 3.3 *Direction (a)* of the Secretary of State's remit letter asked us to consider realistic and affordable basic pay levels for the remit group, to recruit, retain and motivate, within the context of the economic and market factors in which the Service operates; and *Direction (d)* of the Secretary of State's remit letter asked us to take account of the need for an element of non-consolidation in the award to stabilise baseline costs for future years.

### *Pay proposals*

3.4 The PSA set out its priorities for 2006-07 as being to maintain morale and continue constructive employee relations to prepare for significant changes resulting from identified efficiencies in the Strategic Development Programme. They also wanted to reduce the differential in pay with other Services' uniformed grades while maintaining an emphasis on reward for performance and to retain an element of non-consolidation so that the baseline costs in future years were stabilised.

3.5 With these priorities in mind the PSA proposed a differentiated, consolidated basic pay award of up to 2.5 per cent, which would increase payroll costs by 2.3 per cent (1.9 per cent excluding the cost of residual guarantees arising from the agreement which established the current pay system prior to our first review). This comprised:

- A consolidated basic pay increase of 2.5 per cent for prison officers below the pay spine maximum delivered through spinal progression;
- A 1 per cent award consolidated for prison officers on the current spine maximum;
- A basic increase of 2.5 per cent for night patrol officers, auxiliary, senior officers and principal officers, consolidated up to revised maxima;
- 1 per cent for those senior and principal officers on spine points 175 and 191 respectively who previously benefited from a 10 per cent increase on promotion and senior and principal officers on the maximum point on their pay spines;
- 2.5 per cent consolidated increase to the pay rate for night custody officers; and
- 2.5 per cent consolidated award for prison governors.

3.6 The PGA proposed a basic pay award for governor grades of 10 per cent, to reflect the fact that average earnings had risen by 47 per cent over the previous 10 years, while governors' salaries had risen by less than 30 per cent, and to help restore parity with colleagues in England and Wales. In support of this proposal, the PGA argued that governors in Northern Ireland managed complex prisons, particularly Maghaberry, which it considered was the most complex in the UK given separation and the range of prisoners held. In its view, the responsibilities of the job were also increased by the exposure of establishments to inspections, visits and interventions from a wider range of external agencies and political representatives than would be the norm elsewhere in the UK.

3.7 The POA proposed a consolidated award of at least 5 per cent on the basis that officers' pay had fallen in real terms by 2.3 per cent since 2003. In support of their case, they argued that whole economy average earnings increased by 4.1 per cent in the year to June 2005 while public sector earnings rose by 4.58 per cent. The POA also drew attention to the additional security costs incurred by staff whose personal details had become publicly available for which, they told us, inadequate compensation had been made and argued that generally staff were likely to incur additional costs to alleviate security concerns. The POA argued strongly in written and oral evidence that the level of the award should not be influenced by the lack of recruitment or retention problems or by comparisons with pay levels in the different working conditions in England and Wales. They also argued that, before discussions on pay and grading had formally commenced, it would be unreasonable to single out prison officers at the maximum for very low basic pay increases as proposed by the PSA.

### *Analysis and recommendation*

3.8 Under our terms of reference we must take account of the evidence available to us on recruitment and retention, morale and motivation, the specific affordability considerations applying to the Service and the wider economic context. We are also conscious of the reform agenda and the impact our recommendations may have on the environment in which negotiations will take place.

3.9 We are aware that some longer serving and, therefore, higher paid prison officers will benefit in 2006 from increments guaranteed to them from the previous pay system. A second group of lower paid officers, who regraded from auxiliary when the current pay system was introduced, benefit from a guarantee that they should be no less favourably treated, in terms of annual awards and incremental pay progression, than equivalent prison officers in England and Wales. These guarantees are not in our control and do not form part of the costing for our recommendations, nor do they influence our judgment on the level of the overall pay award. The read across to increases in the England and Wales scale will continue as long as the pay system in that Service remains the same. In our view, irrespective of developments in England and Wales, this link should be examined as part of the pay and grading review under the Strategic Development Programme.

3.10 We have explained in previous reports that, under our terms of reference, we are required to recommend appropriate pay levels in the light of all the evidence presented to us each year. We are also obliged to take account of regional and local variations in labour markets and this influences our approach to Northern Ireland. While we understand that the PSA and the staff associations look across to England and Wales, we hold to the view that pay levels and awards should reflect the circumstances applying in Northern Ireland, including the nature of the job, the security environment, recruitment and retention and affordability.

3.11 We have paid heed to the Treasury guidance to all departments on the level of pay awards, which, as in previous years, focused on the earnings growth impact. For 2006, the guidance identified an earnings growth threshold of 3.5 per cent as acceptable in the absence of a robust business case to justify more. This threshold takes account of all elements of pay including pay progression. We are also mindful of the affordability evidence provided by the PSA and of the wider economic environment characterised by low and stable inflation.

3.12 We also consider the evidence relating to the working environment and the security situation. While the statistics on attacks and threats over the past three years indicate a downward trend, we are aware from the evidence and from our own discussions with staff on visits that the threat, and perceived threat, to staff and their families remains a real concern. In oral evidence, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State pointed to improving security but added that the working environment in the Northern Ireland Prison Service remained significantly different from elsewhere in the UK and this was unlikely to change in the short term.

3.13 Our responsibility is to respond to the evidence each year. We take account of indices on prices and earnings movements, but our recommendations are for one year only and not intended to maintain the relative value of earlier pay levels or to establish fixed relativities. The evidence indicates that pay levels are competitive compared to other groups in Northern Ireland. In the light of this and the recruitment and retention position we do not believe that an award at the levels proposed by either of the staff associations would be appropriate.

3.14 The PSA proposed a differentiated award that would advantage staff below the maximum of their pay spine. We understand the logic of this proposal; in earlier reports we have considered the relative position of staff in their pay ranges, particularly officers who regraded from auxiliary. However, in the light of the Strategic Development Programme, which offers the real prospect of pay and grading reform within a strategic framework, and the need to maintain improving employee relations in a period of significant change, we consider that, for this year, a straightforward across the board award is appropriate.

3.15 We have balanced all these considerations to arrive at our recommendation.

**Recommendation 1:** We recommend a consolidated increase in basic pay of 2 per cent, to be achieved through spinal progression, for all remit group staff with the exception of those senior officers and principal officers covered by recommendation 2 and governor grades covered by recommendation 4. The effect of this recommendation is set out in Appendix D.

#### Senior and principal officer pay on promotion

3.16 In evidence for our 2004 report, the PSA proposed to eliminate overlapping pay bands for officer grades and that staff promoted from prison officer to senior officer, or senior officer to principal officer should receive a minimum increase of 10 per cent on promotion. We recommended accordingly. This had the unintended effect of giving newly promoted senior and principal officers a higher salary than existing officers considerably more experienced in the grade. In response to this, for our 2005 report, the PSA proposed, and we recommended, that the guaranteed pay on promotion to senior and principal officer be limited to 3 per cent. We made no recommendation in respect of those experienced officers whose salary had been overtaken by newly promoted colleagues, but urged the PSA and the POA to address the issue. They were unable to agree a solution.

#### *Pay proposals*

3.17 For this report, the PSA proposed that senior and principal officers on spine points 175 and 191 respectively, who previously benefited from the 10 per cent increase on promotion, should receive the same increase as those at the maximum point of the scale (1 per cent in their proposal), rather than the 2.5 per cent they proposed for other officers. They added that they would consider what further steps could be taken to narrow the gap as part of the more fundamental pay and grading exercise.

3.18 To address concerns of senior and principal officers who had seen their pay overtaken by less experienced colleagues, the POA proposed that all senior officers be moved to spine point 175 and all principal officers to spine point 191. This solution would ensure that no officer was penalised in pay terms for an anomaly that was not of their making.

### *Analysis and recommendation*

3.19 It was made clear to us in our discussions during our visit to Northern Ireland that this issue is the source of considerable grievance among those staff who have seen their pay overtaken by less experienced colleagues. They are fully aware that the lack of progression in the pay system means that the pay gap cannot be closed without specific intervention. We do not, however, consider the proposals put forward by the PSA or the POA acceptable. Raising the pay of all staff to correct the anomalous position of a small minority would incur a disproportionate cost. On the other hand, the PSA's proposal that the gap should be closed solely by restricting the pay of officers who had benefited from 10 per cent in line with the rules then applying would, in our view, replace one grievance with another. We expect this issue to be resolved through the pay and grading review. In the interim, our recommendation, which is set out in detail below, will narrow the gap.

**Recommendation 2:** We recommend that, with effect from 1 April 2006, those senior and principal officers on spine points 172 and 185 should move one spine point up their pay range in addition to the overall basic pay increase of 2 per cent. We further recommend that those senior and principal officers on spine points 175 and 191 respectively, should receive an overall basic pay increase of 1.5 per cent to help reduce the gap with colleagues more experienced in the grade.

**Scale minima and maxima** 3.20 The PSA made a number of proposals: that the pay range minima for prison officers, senior officers and principal officers be increased by five spinal points, and the maxima be increased by two points; that the minima and maxima for each governor range be increased by five spinal points; and that the pay range maxima or minima for the auxiliary and night patrol officer grades remain unchanged on the grounds that both were paid above the rate of comparators in England and Wales. The PSA would seek to subsume them into the grading structure as part of the wider pay and grading review.

3.21 The POA were content to consider all minima in the context of restructuring but argued that the maxima for all grades should be increased by the amount of the basic pay award. The PGA proposed an increase to the pay range maxima for governor grades of 12 spinal points, pointing to the higher maxima available to colleagues in England and Wales.

### *Analysis and recommendation*

3.22 We received limited detailed written evidence from the parties relating to pay range minima and maxima. In discussion in oral evidence, the staff associations expressed the view that this was an issue for discussion as part of the overall review of pay and grading. We concur with this view. In the interim, however, we think it appropriate that the pay range maxima be increased by an amount sufficient to allow all staff to receive a fully consolidated basic award. For most grades this will mean an increase in the range maxima of four spinal points. However, at the auxiliary and night patrol officer grades a small number of staff receive salaries that exceed their current range maxima. To allow all staff at these grades to receive a fully consolidated award will require the range maxima to be increased by six points.

3.23 We note that, to avoid re-introducing overlaps between the pay ranges of the officer grades, range minima would need to be increased in line with the basic award. The exceptions to this are the auxiliary grade, a grade to which there has been no recruitment since 2001, and night patrol officers, where the PSA has no plans to recruit staff at the current range minima.

**Recommendation 3:** We recommend that the pay range minima and maxima for all governor grades, principal officers, senior officers, prison officers and prisoner custody officers be increased by four spine points. We further recommend that the pay range minima remain unchanged for auxiliary and night patrol officers and the maxima be increased by 6 spine points. The effect of this recommendation is set out in Appendix D.

**Northern Ireland Prison Service payment** 3.24 *Direction (c)* of the Secretary of State's remit letter asked us to review the overlap between the principal officer grade and the governor 5 grade. *Direction (f)* asked us to consider, in the context of comparative rates, the arguments for the consolidation of the NIPS payment into basic pay for governor grades.

3.25 There is interdependency between the issues raised by these Directions which we therefore consider together.

#### *Pay proposals*

3.26 The PSA proposed that overlaps in the pay structure be addressed as part of the pay and grading reforms but noted that their proposal to consolidate the NIPS payment into governors' basic pay would impact on the differential between governor 5 and principal officer.

3.27 The staff associations were content to address the overall issue of overlaps in the structure as part of the wider pay and grading review, but both welcomed the PSA's proposal that the NIPS payment for governor grades be consolidated.

3.28 The NIPS payment was consolidated into basic pay for officer grades in 1995, but has remained as a separate, non-pensionable payment for governors ranging (at current values) from £3,701 to £4,561 depending on grade. In their written evidence, the PSA said that it agreed in principle to the consolidation of the NIPS payment, to eliminate the overlap with the principal officer grade and to bring governor pay scales better in line with comparable jobs in other services, though they considered that the issue was best handled as part of the pay and grading review. In supplementary evidence, however, following discussions with the POA, the Agency proposed that the NIPS payment should be consolidated from 1 April 2006 but, to offset the cost of implementation, the pay award for governor grades should be brought in line with their proposal for officer grades, that is, 1 per cent for those at the top of their pay range and 2.5 per cent for the remainder. In addition, on call and special duty allowances would be withdrawn from all governor grades.

3.29 The PGA, who had not been involved in discussions, told us in oral evidence that, while they welcomed the proposal to consolidate, they would wish to seek members' views on the proposed impact on the pay award and the removal of on call and special duty allowances, and to negotiate with the PSA on these issues.

### *Analysis and recommendation*

3.30 We welcome the PSA's proposal to consolidate the NIPS payment, which would substantially reduce the pay overlap between the principal officer and governor 5 grade. As we have stated in earlier reports, we consider that there is a *prima facie* case for consolidation when comparing governor basic pay rates with other groups in Northern Ireland. We note that the POA are content with the conditions in the PSA's proposal. The PGA wanted to consider these conditions further. In view of their position, and the fact that the allowances that would be withdrawn as a condition for consolidation lie outside our remit, we are content to recommend consolidation subject to the acceptance by the POA and the PGA of all the conditions proposed by the PSA.

**Recommendation 4:** We recommend that the NIPS payment be consolidated, at its 2005 value, into basic pay for governor grades before the application of the 2006 basic pay award subject to the acceptance by the POA and the PGA of the conditions proposed by the PSA. In light of our overall pay recommendation, the effect of these conditions would be to limit the annual award from 1 April 2006 to 1 per cent for those on the current pay range maximum and to 1.5 per cent for those one point below the current maximum, with the award for the remainder 2 per cent. In addition, on call and special duty allowances would be withdrawn from all governor grades with effect from 1 April 2006. The effect of this recommendation is set out in Appendix D.

**Performance pay** 3.31 *Direction (e)* of the Secretary of State's remit letter asked us to take account of the reform and modernisation agenda, which emphasised the requirement to link pay to performance.

### *Pay proposals*

3.32 The PSA proposed to retain the fund that provided for a 1 per cent unconsolidated, non-pensionable payment to all grades for 100 per cent achievement of key performance targets, with a lesser achievement rewarded pro rata. For governors, the arrangements provide for a further unconsolidated, non-pensionable award of up to 4 per cent for the achievement of their establishment's targets and individual performance markings. The PSA considered that it was appropriate that an award to recognise in-year performance against an annual target should continue to be unconsolidated.

3.33 The POA proposed that all staff should have access to a 4 per cent performance award on the basis that all contributed to meeting establishment targets. In their view, it was inequitable to single out governor grades to receive a larger award. The PGA proposed that the 4 per cent award should be consolidated for governors below the maximum of their pay range to allow them to progress through the range.

### *Analysis and recommendation*

3.34 In our 2004 report, we acknowledged staff association concerns about the performance pay arrangement, which we consider offer little or no incentive to uniformed staff. We expressed the hope that the staff associations and the PSA would enter into meaningful discussions on the way forward, including examining alternatives to the current service-wide approach. We are disappointed that these discussions have not taken place but consider that they should now be taken forward as part of the Strategic Development Programme. Similarly, we consider that the Programme offers the opportunity to resolve structural issues relating to the pay of governors and uniformed grades. In the interim, we recommend the continuation of the current performance pay system. Under this system, the service-wide performance

award will be based on the achievement of weighted targets for 2005-06, as proposed by the PSA and reproduced at Appendix C. Awards for staff who were not appointed for the full year should be paid pro-rata. Governor grades will continue to be eligible for up to 4 per cent for the achievement of their establishment's targets and personal performance.

**Recommendation 5:** We recommend an unconsolidated service-wide performance award for all remit staff of up to 1 per cent. We further recommend unconsolidated performance awards for governor grade staff of 4 per cent for a box 1 mark, 3 per cent for a box 2 mark, and 2 per cent for a box 3 mark.

**Required hours addition** 3.35 *Direction (g)* asked us to consider the appropriateness of a required hours addition (RHA) for designated governor grades to replace on call duty allowances, to reflect the requirement for attendance at post at short notice, outside rostered hours.

3.36 The PSA acknowledged in evidence the PGA's aspiration to have an RHA for governor grades similar to that paid to colleagues elsewhere in the UK. In the Agency's view, however, pay rates for governor grades took account of their "all hours worked" status and there was no case for an RHA. Although the PSA rejected the case for such an addition, it agreed to consider the position as part of the pay and grading review.

3.37 The POA supported the principle that governors should have parity of pay with colleagues in England and Wales, which an RHA would help to achieve, but accepted that it should be considered as part of the pay and grading review. The PGA made no specific proposals but noted that, in our 2005 report, we recommended that the PSA and staff associations discuss the issue under the general heading of restructuring.

3.38 Given that remuneration for governor grades, including the appropriateness of an RHA, will be considered in the pay and grading review, we make no recommendation on an RHA.

**Other allowances** 3.39 We had no specific direction to consider specialist and other allowances. The PSA made no specific proposals but advised us that they intend to examine them as part of the pay and grading review. The POA proposed that they be increased in line with their proposed basic award of 5 per cent to make good lost ground. The PGA presented no evidence.

3.40 In earlier reports we have expressed our reservations about the appropriateness of specialist allowances, other than for work for which there is a specific recruitment and retention justification. We consider that their future should be resolved as part of the pay and grading review. In the interim we recommend that they be frozen at their current value. We examined other allowances in relation to price indices for the costs involved. We found that the indices showed a fall in the components relevant to the boot and clothing allowances but an increase in those relevant to the dog grooming allowance. This is reflected in our recommendations.

**Recommendation 6:** We recommend that all specialist allowances remain at their current value with effect from 1 April 2006. The effect of this recommendation is set out in Appendix E.

**Recommendation 7:** We recommend that the dog grooming allowance be increased by 3.2 per cent with effect from 1 April 2006. The boot and clothing allowances should remain at their current value. The effect of this recommendation is set out in Appendix E.

**Night custody officers** 3.41 Earlier in this report we referred to the recruitment and appointment of night custody officers. In our 2005 report, we noted that the duties and terms and conditions of this new grade of staff were under discussion between the PSA and the POA. During our visit to Northern Ireland we met night custody officers who expressed concern that their terms and conditions did not match expectations raised in the recruitment process; in particular, the advertisement to which they had responded suggested the availability of a pay range when, in fact, they received a spot rate.

3.42 We welcome, therefore, the agreement reached between the PSA and the POA on the range of duties to be performed by night custody officers, who will work a 44 hour week and receive a flat rate salary of £18,700. We endorse the pay rate agreed, which should be updated by 2 per cent from 1 April 2006 in line with recommendation 1 above.

**Overall cost of our recommendations** 3.43 Our recommendations this year represent a new paybill cost of some £1½ million, or 2.1 per cent. This excludes the cost of the residual guarantees for officers arising from the agreement that established the current pay system prior to our first review.

---

## **Chapter 4: Final comments**

4.1 We have addressed all of the directions in the Secretary of State's remit letter for this review. Our recommendations reflect our judgement of what is appropriate in the light of the evidence available to us.

4.2 We very much welcome the work on pay and grading reform being taken forward under the Strategic Development Programme and are encouraged by the improved relations between the PSA and the staff associations. We expect the parties to ensure that this constructive approach continues. Against this background, we are agreed that a straightforward award is appropriate to allow the parties time to conclude their negotiations. However, we will need to review our approach next year if the parties themselves do not agree a way forward.

4.3 We stand ready to assist the parties in the process in any way that they agree would be helpful, including bringing forward our 2006-07 work programme.

Jerry Cope (*Chair*)

Beryl Brewer

Derek Bourn

Ray Coughlin

Peter Heard

Frank Horisk

Sarah Murray

Peter Riach

Ann Robinson

Peter Tett



---

## ***Appendix A: Standing terms of reference***

The role of the Prison Service Pay Review Body is to provide independent advice on the remuneration of governing governors and operational managers, prison officers and support grades in the England and Wales Prison Service. The Review Body will also provide independent advice on the remuneration of prison governors, prison officers, prison auxiliaries and night patrol officers in the Northern Ireland Prison Service.

In reaching its recommendations the Review Body is to take into account the following:

- The need to recruit, retain and motivate suitably able and qualified staff taking into account the specific needs of the Prison Service in England and Wales and the Northern Ireland Prison Service;
- Regional/local variations in labour markets and their effects on the recruitment and retention of staff;
- Relevant legal obligations on the Prison Service in England and Wales and the Northern Ireland Prison Service, including anti-discrimination legislation regarding age, gender, race, sexual orientation, religion and belief and disability;
- Government policies for improving the public services, including the requirement to meet Prison Service output targets for the delivery of services;
- The funds available to the Prison Service in England and Wales and the Northern Ireland Prison Service as set out in the Government's departmental expenditure limits; and
- The Government's inflation target.

The Review Body shall also take account of the competitiveness of the Prison Service in England and Wales with the private sector, and any differences in terms and conditions of employment between the public and private sectors taking account of the broad employment package including relative job security.

The Review Body may also be asked to consider other specific issues.

The Review Body is also required to take careful account of the economic and other evidence submitted by the Government, staff and professional representatives and others.

Reports and recommendations for the Prison Service in England and Wales should be submitted to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the Director General of the Prison Service as Head of the Executive Agency. Reports and recommendations for the Northern Ireland Prison Service will be submitted to the Prime Minister and to the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, and the Director General of the Northern Ireland Prison Service as Head of the Executive Agency.

Footnote:

In England and Wales the grades in our remit are:

Governing governors: the only governor in an establishment.

Operational managers: are Phase 1 staff who either:

were in the former "governor grades" on implementation of Phase 1 Prison Service Pay and Grading changes on 1 July 2000

or,

have since 1 July 2000 passed a Level 3 (Operations) Job Simulation Assessment Centre and have taken up a post that requires that accreditation.

Prison officers: Staff in the grades of prison officer, senior officer, principal officer, grade VIIIA.

Support grades: Staff who are operational support grades, prison auxiliary officers and night patrol officers.

In Northern Ireland the grades in our remit are:

Prison governors: Staff in the grades of governor 1, governor 2, governor 3, governor 4 and governor 5.

Prison officers: Staff in the grades of principal officer, senior officer and prison officer.

Other grades: Staff in the grades of prison auxiliary, night patrol officer, night custody officer and prison custody officer.

## Appendix B: Remit letter from the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland



**Northern  
Ireland  
Office**

Northern Ireland Office  
11, Millbank  
London SW1P 4PP  
Telephone (070 7211 6464)  
Facsimile (020 7211 0246)  
www.nio.gov.uk

Secretary of State for Northern Ireland

Jerry Cope  
Chairman  
Prison Service Pay Review Body  
Office of Manpower Economics  
76 Oxford Street  
LONDON  
W1D 1BS

29 July 2005

*Da Tony*

I am writing to set out the issues on which the Government seeks the advice of the Prison Service Pay Review Body in respect of the Northern Ireland Prison Service for the period beginning 1 April 2006.

I am required to give you directions under Regulation 4 of the Prison Service (Pay Review Body) Regulations 2001 as to the considerations to which you are to have regard. These directions supplement your Standing Terms of Reference.

As you know, the Northern Ireland Prison Service has launched a comprehensive Strategic Development Programme which is looking at many aspects of the Service. The Director General intends that this programme will deliver significant changes to the current grading and pay structure within the Pay Review Body remit groups. The timetable for drawing up the resultant Blueprint is very stretching, but I do not anticipate that the full proposals will emerge until the end of this calendar year at the earliest. Therefore at this stage, the direction is based on the existing framework. I have deliberately not specified a 12 month period, to leave open the scope for earlier introduction of more sweeping changes before the end of 2006/07, if negotiations progress well. My officials will keep in close contact with the secretariat.

The primary considerations for the award with effect from 1 April 2006 are:

- (1) that it should be consistent with the Department's PSA target to reduce the cost per prisoner place;
- (2) the Government's modernisation agenda and pay strategy;



Northern  
Ireland  
Office

- (3) that it is consistent with the implementation of the recommendations in the Hamill report, which may affect the period to which your recommendations apply.

The following are the specific matters which I refer to the Pay Review Body and the considerations to which it is to have regard:

- (a) to consider realistic and affordable basic pay levels for Prison Officer Grades and Prison Governor grades (the remit group) to recruit, retain and motivate, within the context of economic and market factors in which the Service operates;
- (b) to consider the appropriateness of the current starting pay and maximum of the pay range of each grade within the remit group and the current pay differentials;
- (c) to review the overlap between the Principal Officer grade and the Governor V grade;
- (d) to take account of the need for an element of non-consolidation in the award to stabilise the baseline costs for future years;
- (e) to take account of the reform and modernisation agenda which emphasises the requirement to link pay to performance;
- (f) in the context of comparative rates, to consider the arguments for the consolidation into basic pay of the Northern Ireland Prison Service Payment for Governor grades;
- (g) to consider the appropriateness of a Required Hours Allowance for designated Governor grades to replace on call duty allowances, to reflect the requirement for attendance at post at short notice, outside rostered hours.



Northern  
Ireland  
Office

- (h) to take account of any proposed changes to terms and conditions on which management and unions had not been able to conclude negotiations.

I require the Prison Service Pay Review Body to report to the Prime Minister, to me and to the Director General of the Northern Ireland Prison Service the results of the examination of these matters as they think fit, in time for the Government to take decisions on the report by early 2006. I will then arrange for your report to be published.

I look forward to receiving your recommendations in due course.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Hain', written over the printed name.

PETER HAIN



## Appendix C: Prison Service Agency's weighting of performance targets

### Corporate and business plan – key performance targets 2005/2006

<b>Target</b>	<b>Weighting (for full achievement)</b>
<b>Security</b>	
No escape for top and high risk prisoners	20
No more than 3 escapes per 1000 medium and low risk prisoners	15
<b>Safety</b>	
The number of staff assaulted by prisoners is less than a ratio of 3 per 100 prisoners	10
The number of prisoners assaulted by prisoners is less than a ratio of 4 per 100 prisoners	10
<b>Regimes and Reducing Re-Offending</b>	
An average of at least 20 hours constructive activity per week for each sentenced prisoner	8
An average of at least 10 hours constructive activity for each remand prisoner	8
To ensure 87% of prisoners serving six months or more are working to a resettlement plan and that 97% of all lifers work to a resettlement plan, including preparation of the plan in the first six months from sentence	8
<b>Staff and Developing the Service</b>	
Each member of staff should receive an average of 5 training days	6
Reduce the rate of absenteeism across the Service by 10%	5
<b>Finance, Corporate Governance and Improving Business Performance</b>	
Lay the Annual Report and Audited Accounts before Parliament prior to the summer recess	0
Ensure the average cost per prisoner place does not exceed £86,290	10
<b>Total for full achievement</b>	<b>100</b>

### Definitions

An assault is:

“when the victim has sustained an injury resulting in death, or his detention in an outside hospital as an inpatient, or any of the following injuries whether or not detained in hospital: fractures, concussion, internal bleeding, crushing, severe cuts or lacerations, severe bruising, burns or scalds, or severe general shock requiring medical treatment”.

Constructive Activity:

“includes all pursuits that play a part in the enhancement of the individual skill, knowledge, attitudes and behaviour or contribute to the reduction in the likelihood of reoffending”.

A Resettlement Plan is:

“a plan developed during induction, based on the assessment of a prisoner’s needs that will address factors associated with offending and increase the likelihood of not offending on release”.

## **Appendix D: Current and recommended pay levels**

### **Current and recommended pay ranges for governor grades**

<i>Grade</i>		<i>Current range £ per annum (spine point)</i>	<i>Recommended range<sup>1</sup> from 1 April 2006 £ per annum (spine point)</i>
<b>Governor 1</b>	Maximum	65,976 (298)	71,823 (315)
	Minimum	61,220 (283)	66,638 (300)
<b>Governor 2</b>	Maximum	59,118 (276)	64,351 (293)
	Minimum	55,407 (263)	60,612 (281)
<b>Governor 3</b>	Maximum	51,156 (247)	55,962 (265)
	Minimum	47,705 (233)	52,448 (252)
<b>Governor 4</b>	Maximum	43,828 (216)	49,401 (240)
	Minimum	40,066 (198)	45,612 (224)
<b>Governor 5</b>	Maximum	39,276 (194)	44,934 (221)
	Minimum	34,671 (169)	40,066 (198)

#### *Note*

Governor 5 also has a trainee single salary rate of £33,482 per annum (spinal point 162) with effect from 1 April 2006.

<sup>1</sup> The recommended ranges include the value of the consolidated NIPS payment. These pay ranges will apply subject to acceptance of the conditions described in recommendation 4.

### **2005 rates of the Northern Ireland Prison Service payment for governor grades<sup>1</sup>**

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Current payment £ per annum</i>
<b>Governor 1</b>	4,084
<b>Governor 2</b>	3,946
<b>Governor 3</b>	3,701
<b>Governor 4</b>	4,489
<b>Governor 5</b>	4,561

<sup>1</sup> Recommended that the Northern Ireland Prison Service payment for governor grades is consolidated into basic pay at 2005 values (see recommendation 4).

**Current and recommended pay ranges for principal officers, senior officers, prison officers, prisoner custody officers, auxiliaries, night custody officers and night patrol officers**

<i>Grade</i>		<i>Current range £ per annum (spine point)</i>	<i>Recommended range from 1 April 2006 £ per annum (spine point)</i>
<b>Principal officer</b>	Maximum	39,472 (195)	40,266 (199)
	Minimum	35,903 (176)	36,626 (180)
<b>Senior officer</b>	Maximum	35,724 (175)	36,444 (179)
	Minimum	32,820 (158)	33,482 (162)
<b>Prison officer</b>	Maximum	32,657 (157)	33,315 (161)
	Minimum	17,077 (27)	17,421 (31)
<b>Prisoner custody officer</b>	Maximum	18,312 (41)	18,681 (45)
	Minimum	17,077 (27)	17,421 (31)
<b>Auxiliary</b>	Maximum	18,681 (45)	19,248 (51)
	Minimum	15,925 (13)	15,925 (13)
<b>Night patrol officer</b>	Maximum	15,969 (NP37)	16,454 (NP43)
	Minimum	14,238 (NP14)	14,238 (NP14)
<b>Night custody officer</b>	Single rate	18,700	19,074

*Notes*

1. The range for night patrol officers is on a separate spinal table to other remit group staff.
2. For both spinal tables, the value of each spinal point is 0.5 per cent higher than the previous point.
3. The range shown for prisoner custody officers is for those working a 39-hour week. It is recommended that those employed for fewer hours per week be paid pro rata.

Spinal Scales<sup>1</sup> (1-316) – Auxiliary, Officer and Governor Grades

Point	£ per annum						
316	72,183	266	56,242	216	43,828	166	34,156
315	71,823	265	55,962	215	43,610	165	33,986
314	71,465	264	55,684	214	43,393	164	33,817
313	71,109	263	55,407	213	43,177	163	33,649
312	70,755	262	55,131	212	42,962	162	33,482
311	70,402	261	54,857	211	42,748	161	33,315
310	70,051	260	54,584	210	42,535	160	33,149
309	69,702	259	54,312	209	42,323	159	32,984
308	69,355	258	54,042	208	42,112	158	32,820
307	69,009	257	53,773	207	41,902	157	32,657
306	68,665	256	53,505	206	41,694	156	32,495
305	68,323	255	53,239	205	41,487	155	32,333
304	67,983	254	52,974	204	41,281	154	32,172
303	67,644	253	52,710	203	41,076	153	32,012
302	67,307	252	52,448	202	40,872	152	31,853
301	66,972	251	52,187	201	40,669	151	31,695
300	66,638	250	51,927	200	40,467	150	31,537
299	66,306	249	51,669	199	40,266	149	31,380
298	65,976	248	51,412	198	40,066	148	31,224
297	65,648	247	51,156	197	39,867	147	31,069
296	65,321	246	50,901	196	39,669	146	30,914
295	64,996	245	50,648	195	39,472	145	30,760
294	64,673	244	50,396	194	39,276	144	30,607
293	64,351	243	50,145	193	39,081	143	30,455
292	64,031	242	49,896	192	38,887	142	30,303
291	63,712	241	49,648	191	38,694	141	30,152
290	63,395	240	49,401	190	38,501	140	30,002
289	63,080	239	49,155	189	38,309	139	29,853
288	62,766	238	48,910	188	38,118	138	29,704
287	62,454	237	48,667	187	37,928	137	29,556
286	62,143	236	48,425	186	37,739	136	29,409
285	61,834	235	48,184	185	37,551	135	29,263
284	61,526	234	47,944	184	37,364	134	29,117
283	61,220	233	47,705	183	37,178	133	28,972
282	60,915	232	47,468	182	36,993	132	28,828
281	60,612	231	47,232	181	36,809	131	28,685
280	60,310	230	46,997	180	36,626	130	28,542
279	60,010	229	46,763	179	36,444	129	28,400
278	59,711	228	46,530	178	36,263	128	28,259
277	59,414	227	46,299	177	36,083	127	28,118
276	59,118	226	46,069	176	35,903	126	27,978
275	58,824	225	45,840	175	35,724	125	27,839
274	58,531	224	45,612	174	35,546	124	27,700
273	58,240	223	45,385	173	35,369	123	27,562
272	57,950	222	45,159	172	35,193	122	27,425
271	57,662	221	44,934	171	35,018	121	27,289
270	57,375	220	44,710	170	34,844	120	27,153
269	57,090	219	44,488	169	34,671	119	27,018
268	56,806	218	44,267	168	34,499	118	26,884
267	56,523	217	44,047	167	34,327	117	26,750

Spinal Scales<sup>1</sup> (1-316) – Auxiliary, Officer and Governor Grades (*continued*)

Point	£ per annum						
116	26,617	87	23,034	58	19,932	29	17,248
115	26,485	86	22,919	57	19,833	28	17,162
114	26,353	85	22,805	56	19,734	27	17,077
113	26,222	84	22,692	55	19,636	26	16,992
112	26,092	83	22,579	54	19,538	25	16,907
111	25,962	82	22,467	53	19,441	24	16,823
110	25,833	81	22,355	52	19,344	23	16,739
109	25,704	80	22,244	51	19,248	22	16,656
108	25,576	79	22,133	50	19,152	21	16,573
107	25,449	78	22,023	49	19,057	20	16,491
106	25,322	77	21,913	48	18,962	19	16,409
105	25,196	76	21,804	47	18,868	18	16,327
104	25,071	75	21,696	46	18,774	17	16,246
103	24,946	74	21,588	45	18,681	16	16,165
102	24,822	73	21,481	44	18,588	15	16,085
101	24,699	72	21,374	43	18,496	14	16,005
100	24,576	71	21,268	42	18,404	13	15,925
99	24,454	70	21,162	41	18,312	12	15,846
98	24,332	69	21,057	40	18,221	11	15,767
97	24,211	68	20,952	39	18,130	10	15,689
96	24,091	67	20,848	38	18,040	9	15,611
95	23,971	66	20,744	37	17,950	8	15,533
94	23,852	65	20,641	36	17,861	7	15,456
93	23,733	64	20,538	35	17,772	6	15,379
92	23,615	63	20,436	34	17,684	5	15,302
91	23,498	62	20,334	33	17,596	4	15,226
90	23,381	61	20,233	32	17,508	3	15,150
89	23,265	60	20,132	31	17,421	2	15,075
88	23,149	59	20,032	30	17,334	1	15,000

Spinal Scales<sup>1</sup> (1-46) – Night Patrol Officers

Point	£ per annum						
NP46	16,702	NP34	15,732	NP22	14,817	NP10	13,956
NP45	16,619	NP33	15,653	NP21	14,744	NP9	13,887
NP44	16,536	NP32	15,576	NP20	14,671	NP8	13,818
NP43	16,454	NP31	15,498	NP19	14,597	NP7	13,749
NP42	16,372	NP30	15,421	NP18	14,525	NP6	13,681
NP41	16,291	NP29	15,344	NP17	14,453	NP5	13,613
NP40	16,210	NP28	15,268	NP16	14,381	NP4	13,545
NP39	16,129	NP27	15,192	NP15	14,309	NP3	13,478
NP38	16,048	NP26	15,116	NP14	14,238	NP2	13,411
NP37	15,969	NP25	15,041	NP13	14,167	NP1	13,344
NP36	15,889	NP24	14,966	NP12	14,097		
NP35	15,810	NP23	14,892	NP11	14,026		

<sup>1</sup> Each point on the spinal scale is 0.5 per cent higher than the previous point.

## Appendix E: Current and recommended allowances

	<i>Current level £ per annum</i>	<i>Recommended level from 1 April 2006 £ per annum</i>
<i>Specialist allowances<sup>1</sup></i>		
Librarian	679	679
Dog handler	723	723
Physical education instructor	723	723
Groundsman	723	723
Hospital officer	814	814
Emergency control room staff	852	852
Works officer	949	949
Laundry officer	1,062	1,062
Caterer	1,118	1,118
Weapons officer	1,118	1,118
Fire officer	1,132	1,132
Instructor <sup>2</sup>	1,183	1,183
	1,490	1,490
Firearms officer	2,322	2,322
<i>Other allowances<sup>3</sup></i>		
Dog grooming allowance	4,385	4,526
Boot allowance	92.80	92.80
Clothing allowance	603.65	603.65

<sup>1</sup> Specialist allowances are not paid to new staff entering these specialisms. Those in receipt of allowances continue to receive them on a protected basis while they remain in their specialism.

<sup>2</sup> The two different rates of payment relate to the different skills levels.

<sup>3</sup> Paid to all officer grade staff who meet the eligibility criteria for payment.



Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

**Online**

[www.tso.co.uk/bookshop](http://www.tso.co.uk/bookshop)

**Mail, Telephone, Fax & E-mail**

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich, NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/General enquiries: 0870 600 5522

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline Lo-call 0845 7 023474

Fax orders: 0870 600 5533

E-mail: [book.orders@tso.co.uk](mailto:book.orders@tso.co.uk)

Textphone 0870 240 3701

**TSO Shops**

123 Kingsway, London, WC2B 6PQ

020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394

68-69 Bull Street, Birmingham B4 6AD

0121 236 9696 Fax 0121 236 9699

9-21 Princess Street, Manchester M60 8AS

0161 834 7201 Fax 0161 833 0634

16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD

028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401

18-19 High Street, Cardiff CF10 1PT

029 2039 5548 Fax 029 2038 4347

71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh EH3 9AZ

0870 606 5566 Fax 0870 606 5588

**TSO Accredited Agents**

(see Yellow Pages)

*and through good booksellers*

ISBN 0-10-167462-7



9 780101 674621