POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE DECISION RECORD

To be completed in cases where a decision is required

DECISION OF POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER

Date: 19 August 2013

Officer presenting: Peter Lewis, CFO

Received in OPCC Date: 12 August

2013 (first version)

OPCC Ref:

EXE 0021/13

Title: Voluntary Redundancy Scheme

Summary of Issue:

The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the launch of a Voluntary Redundancy Scheme for Police Staff.

This report is written with continued austerity measures at the forefront of consideration and is not recommending an enhanced scheme for voluntary redundancy, which will be referred to throughout this report as VR.

Recommendations presented:

It is RECOMMENDED that the VR Scheme is agreed to be offered on the same conditions as the compulsory redundancy terms and with no added incentives.

Highlights of Issue:

Leicestershire Police is facing a continued significant challenge to its financial security and is required to make further budgetary savings in the region of £20m (this figure is under constant revision) by April 2016.

The Change Team have had the first year savings plan agreed including a proposed reduction in police staff numbers (c30 posts in 2013).

Leicestershire Police ran a Voluntary Redundancy (VR) scheme in 2010 which succeeded in mitigating a number of compulsory redundancies. Under this previous scheme 44 police staff employees left the organisation by means of VR and 43 by means of Compulsory Redundancy.

The same redundancy payments were offered to staff who left by VR as those exited by a compulsory redundancy situation.

The current Leicestershire Police redundancy pay provision is based on the statutory scheme; however, individuals are paid an actual week's salary rather than the payment being capped where this exceeds £450 per week.

The current redundancy provision of paying an actual week's pay is contractual and contained within the current Police Staff Redundancy Procedure which is collectively agreed with the Trade Union.

The total maximum indicative costs of a future VR scheme would be £3.2 million. This is based on a worst case scenario whereby all 241 staff who are aged 55 or over elected for VR and it was granted. Their VR costs would include a capital cost payment to the pension fund.

It is unlikely that all would apply in the same way that the Force is not likely to need to make 241 compulsory redundancies.

Based on the total VR redundancy cost from 2010 a more likely cost would be £400k

The Trade Union are supportive of a VR scheme as it demonstrates efforts by the Force to mitigate compulsory redundancy.

It was resolved that:

The recommendation be accepted, noting that staff will have their payments based on an actual week's salary whether that amount is above or below the £450 cap as set out in the statutory scheme.

OFFICE OF PCC APPROVAL

Chief Finance Officer:

I have been consulted about the proposal and confirm that appropriate advice has been taken into account in the preparation of this report. I am satisfied that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the Police and Crime Commissioner

Signature

Name: Peter Lewis

Date 19 August 2013

Publication Scheme

Decision of Monitoring Officer:

As Monitoring Officer for the Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire I have determined that:

It is appropriate to publish this record of decision made by the Police and Crime Commissioner: Yes / Part Redacted / No.

It is appropriate to publish the contents of the assessment of the decision by either of the senior post holders in the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire (i.e. either the Chief Executive or Chief Finance Officer):

Yes / Part Redacted / No-

It is appropriate to publish details of the decision by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire: Yes / Part-Redacted / No.

Reasons for any non Publication (referencing appropriate legislation):

Signature Poelo

Name: Paul Stock

Date 20 9 13

Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire

Having received the advice set out above and reviewed relevant documentation my decision in regard of this matter is:

Supported / Not Supported

Signature

. Or Charles de

Date 22/8/13.