

RATIONALE FOR POSITIVE ACTION STEPS

This document sets out the positive action steps which the Police Federation of England and Wales proposes to take in relation to its electoral arrangements and the rationale for those steps.

The impact of these steps will be carefully evaluated. The intention is to ensure that the programme is working as well as possible, and is as effective as possible in increasing equality and diversity within the Federation.

The proposed approach has emerged from a wide process of consultation¹.

1. Background and introduction

The Police Federation of England & Wales (“PFEW”) is the representative body for police officers from the rank of constable to chief inspector across the 43 police forces of England and Wales. PFEW’s existence is based in statute² and its constitution provided for in statutory instrument³.

In Spring 2013 the Federation set up an Independent Review (“the Review”) to consider “whether any changes [were] 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 Independent Panel was asked, in particular, to look at how 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

¹ See p22

² Section 59 Police Act 1996

³ Currently (November 2017) Police Federation Regulations 1969

- 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’.

In making its recommendations the Panel was asked to have regard to: value for money, the unique position and responsibilities of the office of constable, the importance of enhancing public confidence in policing, equality and diversity, and transparency of decision-making and the subsequent action.

The Panel published its Final Report in January 2014. At the Federation’s annual conference in May 2014, the conference voted to implement the Review’s recommendations.

The implementation process has involved engagement with the Home Office. It was recognised by PFEW and the Home Office that the existing constitutional arrangements would need to be replaced to implement the Review. The current Police Federation Regulations are being replaced. The new regulations will include a duty on the Federation to carry out regular assessments of the diversity of its membership and representatives and to report annually on the steps it is taking to promote diversity and to encourage participation in the Federation by persons who share a particular protected characteristic where participation by such persons is disproportionately low and provision for the Federation to make (subject to the approval of the Home Secretary) its own Rules, including the ability to do so in relation to the conduct of the election of Federation representatives.

Having been specifically asked to have regard to equality and diversity, the Review commented extensively on the subject and made a number of recommendations for improvements. Its analysis was in short:

“...we think trust involves clearly and visibly representing everyone in the organisation including minority groups. Despite many efforts and initiatives that we acknowledge, the Police Federation has consistently fallen short in this area and significant action is needed to address it. A representative

Federation ought to be setting the standard in equality and diversity, demanding better progress from police forces around the country. Instead its voice is muted and it is still over represented by white, middle-aged men.”

2. Overview of the Current Structure and Current Approach to Reserved Seats and of the New Structure and Proposed Approach to Safeguarding of Seats

The current structure and approach to reserved seats

PFEW conducts elections every three years. The last triennial cycle began in 2013 and a further cycle was due to begin in 2016. As a result of the implementation of the Review, the requirement to conduct those elections was deferred⁴ (and changes were made to conference arrangements). The position explained below is that by which recent elections, up to and including the cycle commencing in 2013, have been conducted.

PFEW’s current constitutional arrangements provide for the election of representative bodies locally, in branches, and centrally, including the reservation of some seats for female members.

The main elements of the current constitution are:

- There is a branch of PFEW in each police force.
- In each branch, the members of each Federated rank (constable, sergeant and inspector⁵) elect an appropriate number (at least 9 per rank and the women’s reserved seat explained below, a total minimum of 10 per rank) of representatives to a rank branch board.
- The three rank branch boards sit together as the Joint Branch Board or JBB.
- Slightly different arrangements apply in the PFEW branch in the Metropolitan Police Service.

⁴ See Police Federation (Amendment) Regulations 2016

⁵ For these purposes, “inspector” includes chief inspector.

- The members of each Federated rank (constable, sergeant and inspector⁶) in each branch elect an appropriate number of delegates to annual conference.
- Those delegates, by rank and on a regional basis, elect representatives to national committees for each Federated rank. Each national committee has 9 members (and the women's reserved seat explained below, a total of 10).
- The three rank national committees sit together as the Joint Central Committee or JCC. Since the Review was adopted and pending the change to the Police Federation Regulations, the JCC has been renamed as the Interim National Board or INB.

The main elements in relation to reservation of seats have been⁷:

- At branch level, all the members of each rank elected one member of the appropriate rank branch board from among the women holding that rank. A woman candidate was not able to stand for both this seat and one of the unreserved seats on the branch board.
- All the members of each rank's branch boards in each region elected, from among the women elected to reserved seats in the region's branch boards, a number of delegates to the appropriate rank central conference.
- All the delegates from each region to each rank central conference elected one woman member to the appropriate rank central committee from among the women elected to reserved seats (and any existing members of the relevant central committee) in the region.

The new structure and the proposed approach to safeguarding of seats

⁶ For these purposes, "inspector" includes chief inspector.

⁷ The position at conference and national level has been adjusted on a temporary basis by the Police Federation (Amendment) Regulations 2016, but the summary represents the system by which current incumbents were elected in the last triennial elections.

The main elements of the new constitution will be:

- There will be a branch of PFEW in each police force.
- In each branch, members will elect an appropriate number of representatives, who will form the Branch Council.
- 20% of seats on the Branch Council will be reserved for sergeants and 20% will be reserved for inspectors.
- The Branch Council will elect a Branch Board (of between 10 – 14 members). 20% of seats on the Branch Board will be allocated to each rank (constable, sergeant and inspector).
- Different arrangements will apply in the PFEW branch in the Metropolitan Police Service.
- A National Council, comprised of the Secretary and Chair of every branch (and a smaller number of additional members) will be formed.
- There will be a National Board, consisting of the National Secretary, the National Chair and 22 members elected from members of the National Council.
- There will continue to be an annual conference, but delegates to that conference will not elect the National Board.

The approach proposed in relation to the “safeguarding” of seats is in summary:

- The previous approach, of reserving seats for women, will be abolished and, other than on the National Council, replaced with “safeguarding” of seats as explained below.
- Seats will be safeguarded for women and BME members on the Branch Council and Branch Board.
- Seats will be safeguarded for women and BME members on the National Board.

- In each case, elections will be held and the safeguarding provisions will be triggered only if and to the extent necessary to address under representation.
- A different approach is necessary for the National Council, because of the nature of that body. There will be additional seats for women and BME members on the National Council. This is explained in more detail on pp 18 -19 below.

3. The Old System: Reserved Seats

Women’s reserved seats have existed within PFEW since at least 1969⁸. The composition and structure of police forces was very different at that point than it is today. The Police Advisory Board reported in 1967⁹ that the number of women police officers had peaked at 3,108. The total number of police officers in 1960 has been reported as having been 72,000¹⁰; which implies that around the time the 1969 Regulations were made that fewer than 5% of police officers were women. Prior to the introduction of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, police forces were often segregated “with female officers having a separate rank structure within their own departments. Women were often located in a physically separate part of the building, with their own offices and changing facilities, and a similarly segregated set of tasks to carry out”.¹¹

The number of women police officers, the proportion of officers who are female and the diversity of police officers by reference to other protected characteristics have all increased significantly since 1969. The approach to reserving seats has however not changed. Nor is it the case that the reservation of seats for women throughout this period has had the effect that the PFEW’s representatives reflect the diversity of its membership.

The reasons for this are considered to include:

⁸ See the Police Federation Regulations 1969 as originally made.

⁹ <http://www.bawp.org/Resources/Documents/History%20of%20women%20police.pdf>

¹⁰ http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/election_2010/parties_and_issues/8645379.stm

¹¹ <http://www.bawp.org/Resources/Documents/History%20of%20women%20police.pdf>

- While police forces are no longer segregated and the proportions of women police officers and of officers with other minority protected characteristics have increased, a significant majority of police officers are white men and the Federation has been seen to be dominated by white men.
- The reservation of seats for women appears to have had the effect of stifling the encouragement of women standing in unreserved seats.
- The reservation of seats has been limited to women. No reservation has been provided for BME members or members with other protected characteristics.
- Issues in connection with flexible working are considered to have had an impact on women's participation. It is believed that women officers are more likely to be serving part-time (often for childcare reasons) and that this has operated as a deterrent from considering the additional voluntary responsibility of being a Federation representative.

It is considered that a different approach is required to encourage wider diversity in PFEW's representation. The proposed approach involves replacing the reservation of seats for women with the safeguarding of seats at branch and National Board level¹² for women and BME members. It is considered that this approach and the other steps PFEW is taking to encourage engagement will encourage a wider level of participation, without maintaining the more rigid separation inherent in reservation.

4. Positive action

Equality legislation, making it unlawful to discriminate on the grounds of protected characteristics, including, amongst others, race, gender, disability, religion or sexual orientation and age, has been in place in England and Wales for many years. However, inequality and under-representation of these groups of people has not been eradicated.

¹² A different approach is necessary for the National Council as is explained on p18-19

Positive action is one way of rectifying the problems of inequality and under-representation where they continue to exist.

Section 158 Equality Act 2010 permits organisations to take reasonable steps to encourage and enable full participation.

In order to take positive action steps, it is necessary:

- to have a reasonable belief that people with a protected characteristic suffer a disadvantage connected to the characteristic or have needs that are different from the needs of people who do not share the characteristic, or that participation in an activity by people who share a protected characteristic is disproportionately low; and
- for the steps taken to be a proportionate means of achieving the aim of enabling or encouraging the disadvantage to be overcome or minimised, or meeting those needs, or enabling or encouraging people who share the protected characteristic to participate.

5. Evidence of disadvantage

After conducting a wide ranging examination of PFEW, the Review found that women were under represented at all levels of the organisations; that there has been a failure to make progress to increase BME representation and that inadequate consideration had been given to all protected characteristics (as defined in the Equality Act 2010).

The Review recommended:

“Equality assessments should be undertaken in each local force and at national level to determine the need for reserve seats for the ‘protected characteristics’.”

PFEW took as its starting point the Home Office workforce statistics for police forces which are updated each year. These include figures, broken down by force, for female and BME members.

In January 2016 PFEW conducted an assessment of the diversity of its representatives at all levels of the organisation. Information was gathered in

relation to gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender re-assignment, disability, religion and age.

Reliable data was not available for the characteristics of PFEW's membership other than gender and ethnicity.

The main findings of the assessment in relation to gender were:

PFEW Membership Data

28% of Police Officers are female, **35,466** of 125,460 Officers of federated rank

PFEW Representative Data

11% of PFEW representatives are females, 197 of 1,714 representatives

20% of the INB are females, 6 of 30 representatives

12% Chairs and Secretaries are females, 10 of 86 representatives

11% Other PFEW representatives are females, 181 of 1,598 representatives

At a branch level, in 41 out of 43 branches the proportion of female representatives was less than the proportion of female members in the branch, in most cases, very substantially less, even taking into account the women's reserved seats.

The main findings of the assessment in relation to ethnicity were:

PFEW Membership Data

5.5% of Police Officers are BME, **6,979** of 126,818 ¹³Officers

Highest proportion of BME Officers is in the **Metropolitan Police Service** (11.7% BME)

92.8% of Police Officers are white, **117,750** of 126,818 Officers

¹³ It is not clear why this figure is different to the figure for total officers in the gender statistics

1.6% of Police Officers ethnicity is not stated, **2,089** of 126,818 Officers

PFEW Representative Data

3.6% of PFEW representatives are BME, **61** of 1,714 representatives

6.7% of the INB are BME, **2** of 30 representatives

2.3% Chairs and Secretaries are BME, **2** of 86 representatives

3.6% Other PFEW representatives are BME, **57** of 1,598 representatives

At a branch level, in 23 out of 43 branches the proportion of BME representatives was less than the proportion of BME members in the branch. In 19 branches there were no BME representatives.

It is clear from the above that both female and BME members of PFEW continue to be significantly under represented at Branch Board, Interim National Council and Interim National Board level.

6. The specific outcomes which it is sought to achieve.

PFEW is committed to clearly and visibly representing everyone in the organisation including minority groups and is prepared to take significant action to do so. PFEW has accepted the recommendation in the Review that equality assessments be conducted to determine the need for reserved seats and specifically that *“some form of safeguarded representation for women should remain and reserved BME representation should be introduced...”*

The specific outcomes which PFEW seeks to achieve at the next triennial elections at branch and national level in 2018 are as follows:

- That so far as possible, the proportion of female and BME representatives on Branch Councils and Branch Boards is similar to the proportion of female and BME members in the relevant force;
- That there are guaranteed minimum numbers of female and BME representatives on the National Council. The composition of the

National Council is such that the approach adopted at branch and National Board level cannot be adopted¹⁴; and

- That so far as possible, the proportion of female and BME representatives on the National Board is similar to the proportion of female and BME members of PFEW.

7. The possible action to achieve those outcomes.

PFEW has considered how to achieve the above outcomes. In particular the following have been considered:

- To allow elections to take place without any positive action (including the abolition of the current system for reserving seats as provided in the Police Federation Regulations).
- To take steps short of safeguarding to encourage participation (as representatives) by female and BME members.
- To reserve seats for female and BME members along the lines currently provided for in relation to women members in the Police Federation Regulations 1969.
- To safeguard seats for female and BME members as set out in this proposal.
- To safeguard seats for all under-represented protected characteristics, or to do so for a wider range of under-represented protected characteristics.

8. The steps it is proposed to take to achieve the relevant aims.

PFEW proposes to take the following steps to achieve the relevant aims:

- the implementation of its equality plan; and
- the safeguarding of seats as set out further below;

¹⁴ This is explained in more detail on p18-19

The detailed rules in relation to the safeguarding of seats will be contained in the National Electoral Arrangements (“NEA”) part of the new Federation Rules, made under the new Police Federation Regulations, but the proposed steps are summarised below. The NEA will be reviewed in advance of each set of triennial elections.

Definition of “BME”

The definition of BME which will be used in the Rules is that a person will be regarded as being BME if he or she defines his or her ethnicity as Black, Asian, Mixed, Chinese or Other on the relevant nomination form. These categories (and the sub-categories which will appear on the nomination form) are the same as those used by the Home Office in defining BME for the police workforce statistics.

Branch Councils outside the Metropolitan Police Service

Each police force has a branch of PFEW. The members in each force elect branch representatives. All such representatives are members of the relevant branch’s Branch Council.

Each Branch Council will safeguard representative positions (“seats”) on the following basis:

- The proportion of BME members in the branch will be rounded up or down to the nearest 0.1%.
- The branch will safeguard that rounded proportion of seats (rounded up or down to the nearest whole number) for BME representatives. If the rounded number is zero, there will be no safeguarding.
- The proportion of women members in the branch will be rounded down to the nearest 5%.¹⁵

¹⁵ It is proposed to round to the nearest 0.1% for BME members and the nearest 5% for women members. Different figures are used for BME and women members because of the proportions of members with each characteristic. The proportion of women members is such that rounding down to the nearest 5% should still secure substantial numbers of women representatives; rounding down to the nearest 5% of BME members would mean that most branches would be rounding down to zero.

- The branch will safeguard that rounded down proportion of seats (rounded down to the nearest number of seats) for female representatives.
- There will be two types of seat: “constituency” seats and “top up list” seats. The number of constituency seats will be the total number of seats in the branch minus the total number of safeguarded seats.
- 20% of the total number of seats will be reserved in constituencies for sergeants and 20% for inspectors.
- The election will be conducted. Constituency seats will be filled. Unsuccessful candidates across the branch will be listed in order of the proportion of votes received.
- If the number of BME or female representatives elected in constituencies is lower than the number of safeguarded seats, the highest placed appropriate candidates will be elected from the list. If it is not necessary to use the safeguarding mechanism, the seats will be filled by the highest placed candidates, regardless of gender or ethnicity.

Branch Boards outside the Metropolitan Police Service

Each branch will have a Branch Board, which is a new body¹⁶, in effect a branch executive committee. Each branch’s Branch Council will elect a Branch Board from amongst those representatives who have been elected to the Branch Council. Incumbent full-time branch officials will also be able to stand for election to the Branch Board, and, where they stand, they will be able to vote.

Each Branch Board will safeguard seats on the following basis:

- 20% of seats will be allocated to each rank (constable; sergeant and inspector) and the same proportion of seats safeguarded at the Branch Council will be safeguarded for women and BME members.
- An election will be held and all candidates listed in order of votes received.

¹⁶ The current joint branch board is replaced outside the MPS with the Branch Council

- (Assuming the Board has 10 seats) the two highest placed constables, sergeants and inspectors are elected.
- If there is safeguarding for BME members and the appropriate number of BME representatives are not elected in the six rank positions, the highest placed BME candidate on the list will be elected. A similar approach is adopted for women candidates. If no safeguarding is necessary, or once all necessary safeguarding has been done, any remaining seats are allocated to the highest placed candidates regardless of gender or ethnicity.

The Metropolitan branch

The Metropolitan branch of PFEW is significantly larger than any other branch. The size and nature of the MPS has meant that historically its constitutional arrangements have been different to those in other branches.

The Metropolitan branch will have three separate Branch Councils. Each council will have an executive committee. Those three committees will form the Metropolitan Branch Board.

The Metropolitan branch will safeguard seats for BME and women members on the following basis:

- The proportion of seats to be safeguarded will be calculated by reference to the proportion of BME and female members in the MPS, in the same way as for other branches.
- Elections will be conducted. If there are fewer BME or women representatives than the relevant proportions, additional representatives will be selected as representatives, members of the appropriate Branch Council or the Branch Board (as the case may be).

The National Council

The National Council is a new body, which will consist of each Branch Board Secretary and Branch Board Chair; two further members from the Metropolitan Police Federation (“the further members”); and additional BME and female members.

These additional members will be elected as follows:

- Each of PFEW's eight regions will select an additional female member; and
- Any region in which the proportion of BME members exceeds 3.5% will select an additional BME member.

The National Board

The National Board (which replaces the Joint Central Committee) will consist of 24 members. The Chair will be elected by the members of PFEW nationally. The Secretary will be appointed by members of the National Board. Each of the regions will elect two members of the Board, with Region 8 (which included the MPS and the City of London Police branches) electing a further two members.

The remaining four Board seats will be elected by the National Council. Safeguarding for BME and women members will operate as follows:

- The proportion of seats to be safeguarded will be calculated by reference to the proportion of BME and female members in PFEW, in the same way (as to rounding) as for branches.
- If at least the minimum number of BME and female representatives have been elected in the regionally elected seats and the Chair position, the highest placed four candidates will be elected.
- If there is a shortfall of BME representatives, the highest placed BME candidate(s) will be elected. If there is no such shortfall, or once safeguarded seats have been allocated, then if there is a shortfall of women representatives, the highest placed woman or women will be elected. If any seats remain after any safeguarding for women, the highest placed candidates regardless of characteristics will be elected.

9. An assessment of the proportionality of proposed action

PFEW has considered the steps taken to date to encourage diversity of representation. These include:

- PFEW has reserved seats for women throughout the organisation for at least 48 years. It has operated regular national meetings for women's reserve members.
- PFEW has a national equality director, who is a member of the Interim National Board and a three year equality plan.
- Each branch of PFEW has an equality leader, sometimes described as an equality liaison officer. The equality leaders meet regularly, with two national meetings a year, and receive training in equality matters. Their role is to promote diversity and equality at branch level.
- PFEW has supported large numbers of discrimination claims (in relation to a wide range of protected characteristics) by members.
- PFEW has had a national equality sub-committee since at least 1992. This sub-committee meets four times a year and sought to promote diversity and equality at national level. It has led campaigns, managed training and publications and championed diversity and equality issues within the relevant national police negotiating frameworks.
- In or around summer 2012 the equality sub-committee established a positive action working group, which met regularly from that date until 2015 at which point its work was subsumed into the implementation of the Review. A campaign which included posters, an app and a toolkit was launched in September 2013.
- PFEW has engaged positively with the following police support associations which cover other protected characteristics: National Trans Police Association; Christian Police Association; Gypsy Roma Traveller Police Association; National LGBT Police Association; National Association of Muslim Police; Jewish Police Association; Pagan Police Association; MPS Disability Staff Association (DSA); National Black Police Association (NBPA); Sikh Police Association; British Association of Women in Policing; and National Police Autism Association.
- Despite these steps, the survey data referred to above shows that there is very significant under-participation as representatives by women and

BME members. PFEW considers that simply continuing these steps (at the same time as removing the women's reserve seat) is highly unlikely to result in appropriate levels of participation.

PFEW has considered maintaining the current system of reserving seats for women, or a slight variation thereof, in its new constitutional arrangements. It has decided that this is inappropriate because:

- The reservation of seats to date has not led to proportionate participation of women members as representatives.
- It is considered that this approach has contributed to a sense of women members as being separate and "provided for". It has not provided and does not provide a dynamic for progress towards an organically representative model.
- The reservation of seats has only been for women, not for BME members (or any other under-represented protected characteristics).

PFEW is instead proposing to adopt a system whereby at branch level and at the National Board, a number of seats are safeguarded for women and BME members. At the National Council, a body which is largely composed of the secretary and chair of each branch, a different approach, more akin to a limited form of reserved seat, has been adopted. The reasons this approach (at branch, National Board and National Council level) is considered to be proportionate are:

- The Review was set up in response to a recognition of an urgent need to change PFEW. A key theme of the Review was the importance of PFEW improving the diversity of its representation.
- If steps are not taken for the next election, which will be the first election under the new constitution, it is likely that, rather than improving diversity, the removal of reserved seats for women will result in PFEW being less diverse.

- There is a public interest in the police service being more representative of the society which it serves. PFEW is more likely to assist with this wider aim if it is itself representative of its membership.
- The steps to be taken at branch and National Board level involve safeguarding, rather than reservation, of seats. This means that, in contrast to the previous approach of reserving seats (for women), elections are conducted without reservation of seat for gender or ethnicity and adjustments are made only if necessary.
- The steps to be taken at the National Council are more akin to the reservation of seats model, but the number of seats reserved is a small proportion of the Council, compared to the proportion of female and BME members of the Federation. The reasons this approach has been adopted are:
 - The Review identified a “key gap” between PFEW’s branches and the JCC and recommended that this be addressed by forming a National Council, composed primarily of the chair and secretary from each branch.
 - Because the composition of the National Council is primarily on an ex officio basis, there is no scope for safeguarding seats in a similar fashion to that at branch and National Board level. It is not considered appropriate:
 - to restrict the ability of branches to choose their secretary or chair; or
 - to vary the core membership of the National Council beyond branch secretaries and chairs, so as to enable a wider pool of potential members.
 - It is considered essential to ensure that there is significant representation of women and BME members on what will be one of PFEW’s two key national bodies.

- The figures for current Branch Chairs and Secretaries on pages 9 – 10 above show that currently 10 of 86 incumbents are female and 2 are BME which suggests that there will be substantial under-representation of women and BME members without additional seats being provided. Accordingly it is proposed that each region elect an additional woman representative and that each region in which the proportion of BME members is greater than 3.5% also elect an additional BME representative. In a region which is electing an additional BME member, a candidate who is both BME and female will be able to choose to stand for one or other position or to stand for both positions. If a BME female candidate stands for both positions and is elected as the BME representative in a region, a further female representative will still be elected.
- It is anticipated that the new National Council will have a total of 100 members (other than Interim National Board/National Board members who will retain membership); composed of 43 Branch Chairs; 43 Branch Secretaries; 2 further members from the Metropolitan Branch; 8 additional female members and 4 additional BME members.
- If the number of female and BME Chairs and Secretaries remains the same, then the effect of the proposed adjustment would be as follows:
 - There would be between 18 and 22 female members of the National Council (depending on the number of additional BME members who are female). 22 female members would be 22% of the size of the National Council compared to the proportion of the membership which is female, which is 28%.
 - There would be 6 BME members of the National Council (and any of the additional female members who are BME). On the basis of 5.5% of members being BME, it is unlikely that many, if any, of the additional female members will be

BME). 6 BME members would be 6% of the size of the National Council compared to the proportion of the membership which is BME, which is 5.5%.

- In relation to female members, the risk of “over-adjustment” is limited. In relation to BME members, the risk of “over-adjustment” is slightly greater. However, there is also a risk of under representation (e.g. if the number of BME chairs and secretaries were to reduce by 2) and the numbers involved are considerably smaller.
- In relation to both female and BME representation, the make up of the National Council will be closely reviewed after the first round of triennial elections and adjustments made to the additional seats should the need arise.
- The Review recommended and PFEW has agreed to reserve 20% of seats at branch level for sergeants and inspectors. Sergeants represent approximately 15% of PFEW membership and inspectors approximately 5.6%. The reservation of 40% of seats at branch level for women and BME members, groups which represent between 28% and 33.5%¹⁷ of the membership, is part of the context in which the proportionality of safeguarding for women and BME members must be assessed.¹⁸
- Consideration was given to extending safeguarding to other protected characteristics, in addition to gender and ethnicity. It was decided not to do that for the time being as:
 - Robust statistics for the proportions of members with other protected characteristics were not available;

¹⁷ 28% is the proportion of female members; 5.5% the proportion of BME members. The precise figure depends on how many BME members are female.

¹⁸ It is a possible consequence of the reservation of 40% of branch seats for sergeants and inspectors that the majority of female representatives will be constables. Figures for 2016 show that 79% of police officers of Federated rank hold the rank of constable and that just under 85% of women police officers hold the rank of constable. No ethnic breakdown of ranks is available, but it is possible, and considered likely, that BME members will also be more likely to be constables.

- There is good information available in relation to gender and BME members and a very clear need, highlighted in the Review for action;
- The more characteristics for which seats are safeguarded, the more difficult it is to conduct elections. This is a particular issue at branch level where 40% of seats are reserved for the ranks of sergeant and inspector;
- The nature of some protected characteristics makes it difficult to manage the safeguarding of seats (e.g. pregnancy is a temporary condition).
- There are potential difficulties with asking members and representatives to disclose publicly protected characteristics which may be “hidden”, as may sometimes be the case in relation to disability and sexual orientation.

10. Measurable indicators of progress towards those aims, set against a timetable

The main indicators of progress will be:

- The numbers and proportions of female and BME candidates in branch and National Board elections.
- The extent to which the safeguarding provisions have needed to be activated in relation to such candidates.
- The total number of female and BME representatives at branch and National Board level and on the National Council, including by rank.
- Whether the proportion of female and BME representatives at branch and National Board level and on the national level is similar to the proportion of female and BME members of PFEW.
- In accordance with regulation 15 Police Federation Regulations 2017¹⁹ PFEW will publish information relating to the protected characteristics of

¹⁹ This is a reference to the consultation draft

its members; members of branches and of the various Federation bodies after each round of triennial elections.

11. The time period for the programme

It is currently intended to adopt the positive action steps for an initial period covering two electoral cycles (those beginning in 2018 and 2021), with time for a review of the position prior to what will be the third electoral cycle. It is however intended that there will be a comprehensive review of the outcomes of the first electoral cycle which may result in changes including action in relation to members with other protected characteristics which are under-represented or the suspension of all positive action.

12. Periods for review of progress of the measures towards the aim to ensure it remains proportionate

The measures will be reviewed after each triennial electoral cycle by the National Board.

The National Board will publish an annual report on the steps it is taking to advance equality of opportunity in the Federation between those who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not share those characteristics. The report will include information on the steps PFEW is taking to encourage persons who share a particular characteristic to participate in the Federation where such participation is disproportionately low.

13. Consultation

PFEW has consulted extensively on the proposed approach.

- As part of the initial consideration of the Review's recommendation by PFEW, a series of workshops with local and national representatives were conducted with the assistance of ERS. From those workshops emerged a proposal to safeguard for female members aiming for proportionate representation rounded down to the nearest 5% and for BME members where the proportion of BME members in a branch or region exceeded 5%.

- In June 2016 the INC²⁰ considered a proposal to safeguard seats for sergeants, inspectors, women and BME members by holding elections, provisionally allocating seats and “bumping” until the relevant safeguarded proportions were met. This proposal was reconsidered in the light of feedback.
- Following the June 2016 INC meeting, a working group with a representative from each of PFEW’s eight regions met on two occasions to consider how best to proceed.
- A series of regional workshops were then held, with representatives from each region at which the “bumping” proposal to branch elections was discussed, together with the main elements of the proposal for branch elections contained in this document.
- A similar presentation was given to the women’s reserve meeting, to the INB and to the INC. It was agreed that the proposed approach should be adopted for branch elections.
- Presentations were made to the INC and to the INB as to possible approaches to National Board elections, after which it was determined that the proposed approach to National Board elections should be adopted.
- Draft Federation Rules containing the proposed safeguarding provisions were circulated to the Federation’s INB and INC for comment on 25th September 2017.
- Following feedback on the draft Rules it was decided to remove the threshold for the triggering of safeguarding for BME members at branch level.

November 2017

²⁰ Consisting of the secretary and chair of each of PFEW’s 43 branches