

POA Scotland Conference, 2022

JOHN CAIRNEY - SNC CHAIR:

Conference, SNC, honorary life members and invited guests, a warm welcome to you all to this, the POA Scotland Annual Conference. As you know, this is our first Conference since 2019 and I hope it's a successful and enjoyable one and I thank Peebles Hydro for hosting Conference once again.

This is the first year of me being Scottish Chair, and to say there's some nerves is an understatement. There might be errors but I'll try to keep them to a minimum. Since our last Conference there's been many changes within our committees and I'd like to welcome the new delegates to Conference. I trust you'll find the experience enjoyable and encourage as many of you to speak in motions throughout the Conference. I'd also like to take this time to welcome the newest members of the SNC, who this will be their first time addressing Conference from this table: Jim McCabe, John Devine, Karen Ewen and Mark Meikle. Now I'd also like to mention the POA's two newest Honorary Life Members, Andy Hogg and Mick Gratton who were both awarded this at POA Conference at Eastbourne earlier this year. Well done both.

As part of Conference we'll be addressed by our Chief Executive, Teresa Medhurst, who will no doubt touch on the pressures that the organisation is going to be under, modernising its practices in the current financial backdrop, and how tough it will be. We'll also hear from the Cabinet Secretary for Justice, Keith Brown, and like you are, I'm keen to hear what he has to say on the important matters affecting the organisation and the impact these will have on our membership.

I also welcome the addresses to Conference from our Deputy General Secretary, Joe Simpson, our National Chair, Mark Fairhurst, and our Honorary Life Members who'll be represented by Andy Hogg.

Starting with the Honorary Life Members, it's great to see you all here. Your continued

attendance is greatly appreciated and the dedication you continue to show this union, even in retirement, is something to be admired. May I take this opportunity to say a special welcome to John Renton and Ann Shannon, I know you've both suffered loss this year, but it's great to have you both with us today. I'd also like to welcome Calum Steele of the Police Federation who, like us, have pressures with recruitment and retention, are having difficult financial conversations with their employer around modernisation of their service, and the black hole that exists within the budget. I don't know if anyone's seen the news this morning, but the whole criminal justice sector has raised a concern through Scottish government to the finance budget that's getting hit. So it's not just Scottish Prison Service. This is all. We also invited our colleagues across from the Irish POA, who will join us later on. So we know it's nice to have them here, it's nice to share experiences, and it's nice to share funny stories with them tonight, and I'm sure that'll be the same, so we welcome them when they come. I'd also like to extend my warm welcome to Adam and Rachel from the SPS. To have them here is a show of respect between both the employer and the union. Yes, we'll have our differences, that's healthy, but the fact that they still attend Conference is a great thing and for me, highlights the importance and success of working on partnership. Whilst you're both here in a professional capacity, I hope you get time to relax and speak with delegates in the SNC in a less formal manner tonight.

I also see our colleagues at the back from the NEC. It's always great to have you here and I hope you enjoy the Conference experience. Contrary to what people think, I've seen you on your emails all morning, so this isn't a day out for you, so I know how it feels!

We've got one noticeable absentee in Steve Gillan, who unfortunately won't be joining us, and we've got Joe Simpson going to do his address, going to speak on behalf, so no doubt there'll be a message from our General Secretary.

I also want to take this time to pass on my best wishes for those that are standing for re-election. I hope nobody thinks this is me of the ballot process. It's just a statement of fact from me that I wish you all the very best in your re-election quest and also extend congratulations to Dave Todd, who was re-elected unopposed for a five-year term.

My final welcomes go to Thompsons. The work they've done on behalf of the membership has been tireless, from the criminal charges to representing the members at IDABs and employment tribunals, the dedication shown has not gone unnoticed and I look forward to their ongoing work on behalf of our members. I'd just like to mention that they've managed to secure £530,000 for 44 of our members over the past year, so I think that's testament to the work they're doing.

Conference, I want to take this time to send a massive thanks to you all for the tireless work you've done for the membership over the COVID period. Like everyone I want to put that period behind us, but this is the first opportunity I've had to properly thank you. The hard work done by you on top of the already busy schedules will never go unnoticed by those we represent. Personally, I remember attending the first Coronavirus meeting in HQ, March 3rd 2020, and you think what happened following that, I don't think anybody could imagine it actually. But the hard work, the dedication, the research that was put in, saved lives. That there is no denying. Our membership rightly questioned our decision making. Delegates, you questioned our decision making as well, and as we said at the start, there will be errors made, but they were genuine errors and they listened, because there was no monopoly on information. So the work that was done by trade unions and the organisation saved lives, and we should never forget that and we should take good comfort from that fact.

Going forward, we're in another crisis, this time an economic one, which will mean our members have to make a choice of heating their homes or putting food on the table. In this day

and age that's an appalling position to be in but we are. There'll be no one in this room who isn't feeling the pinch of the crisis at this time, but we must continue to fight, we must continue to challenge government to help ease the cost-of-living crisis that we're currently facing and we will. As I'm into my second year as SNC Chair, I can confidently say it's been a whirlwind time. Barely been time to stop and think of the enormity of this role. I hope I've shown glimpses of the type of Chair I'm going to be by attending branches in official capacity, which this Conference demanded years back. I hope it's been well received – both myself and Jim have been going about, so I hope it's well received and we'll continue to do it.

Dare I say the regular comms we've sent out have been well received also? There's a motion to that, so we'll find out later on if that's the case, but we certainly hope that it has been.

Breaking news.

As Chair of the SNC, I want to personally thank them for all the hard work they've done on behalf of our membership. It generally goes unseen from the wider membership but I know the hours and I know the miles that each and every one of these guys and gals have put in, and I thank them for it and I know they will continue to do it going forward, so thank you.

Out with COVID, as a committee over the past 18 months we've worked closely with the SPS in partnership to push forward important, high-end agenda items. We highlighted as required to make the workplace safer for our members. For me, the biggest success to this was the introduction of the photocopying of prisoners' mail as a method of stopping psychoactive substances from being introduced. In 2015 we sat at Scottish Conference along the road and we had a 90-minute presentation about the demon drug that was Spice. At that time it wasn't big in the SPS, but when it hit, it hit. So I have to praise both the committees and the employer for coming to that solution, because the impact, the positive impact that it's had on our members and the prison population has been excellent. But that said, we will not rest on

that success, we have to continue, we have to find new ways of doing more work to stop even more of it coming in, and we will.

Arguably the biggest workplace challenge facing our membership just now is a staffing crisis that the organisation is feeling. As you know, we sit at workforce planning and we're presenting ideas to how we think the organisation can benefit from making changes to the recruitment process. We're getting our ideas across, and others in the group are starting to take on board, we're working closely with it, but I'm conscious that there's items on the agenda about this, so I'll pause at that stage.

As I said at the beginning, Teresa Medhurst will address Conference and may mention the ongoing, existing changes within the organisation that we're involved with at every level. These include the introduction of Kilmarnock back into public sector, something, as a union, we were pushing for, for years. I think we have to praise Scottish government for the brave decision to bring it back in under the current financial backdrop, but we must ensure that the terms and conditions are properly TUPE'd across, the staffing profiles are accurate and reflect public prisons, and we're heavily involved with that as the process goes on.

We're also involved in HR Digital Transformation Strategy which is actually a very exciting project, considering its digital transformation. That should improve and streamline the HR function including pay, including the way ex gratia etc. should be paid. There's also three modern prisons that we're involved in, that are currently still to open, being HMP Stirling, Highland and Glasgow. Again, all these three will be publicly run, so again we have to make sure that staffing profiles etc. are ready for that.

That's just a wee update to the stuff that we're doing. I just want to finish with, as a union, we've been very clear that we won't stop until we achieve the recognition for the operational members. To be crystal clear, this never is and never has been an attack on fellow trade union

members who do an invaluable job within the organisation, and it's important that we get that message out. Our argument is simple: the job roles are different and we must ensure that operational members get rewarded for this.

Conference, who worked Christmas Day, Boxing Day and other public holidays? Our members. Who worked directly with unruly prisoners? Our members. Who worked with prisoners with severe mental health conditions? Our members. Who are subject to sickening assaults? Our members. Who can't access many family-friendly policies? Our members. Who can't benefit from the work/life balance and saving money travelling to work working hybrid? Our members. I think you get the gist of where we're going and the reason why this trade union believe our operational members should be treated differently from our non-operational colleagues when it comes to paying allowance. And I give the assurance that we won't stop until we get some achievement on that.

I don't want to take up any more time, Conference, we've got a busy agenda, so I hope you enjoy Conference and have a pleasant experience. Thank you.

<Applause>

Conference, just before we move to Standing Orders, we've got the scrutineers and tellers being Willie Mulholland and Garry McKendrick. I seek Conference's approval, a show of cards.

Thanks. I invite Jim McCabe to move Standing Orders.

Jim McCabe – SNC Vice Chair and Chairman of Standing Orders Committee: Chair Conference, I'm pleased to move Standing Orders on behalf of the Standing Orders Committee for Scottish Conference 2022. First thing I would ask is delegates to take note of the start and finish times as detailed in the agenda. They're subject to change. However, this moment in time there's no changes needed.

The voting structure will remain the same as previous years. There's voting cards contained in your delegates' pack. On each motion, the Chair will rule that the motion is either carried or lost on a show of cards. The rules of debate are covered within the Standing Orders report detailed in your agenda, and report guidance is also provided, to advise delegates of the formal process for raising points of order. It clearly describes the circumstances under which legitimate points of order can be raised in the first instance, and what constitutes a point of order. It also describes a process for challenging the ruling of the Chairman. I would ask Conference to always abide by the rules of debate.

Conference, the Standing Orders Committee received 103 motions in total. The Standing Orders Committee rejected 7 and suggested 9 motions to be reworded to the respective branches. 5 branches were offered composite motions, and all were accepted. 10 were asked for clarification before these were withdrawn. Conference, that leaves us with an agenda of 84 motions. Conference, SNC will not, as a matter of course, be responding to every motion and therefore will not be indicating our position in these motions.

Conference, there is no testing or fire drills from the hotel, so if the fire alarm goes, we've got to leave the hall and the staff outside will show us to the respective places.

Conference, I ask that delegates speak to the Chair at all times and use appropriate language and please, turn off all the mobile phones.

Chair, Conference, I'm going to ask you to formally adopt Standing Orders.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference accept Standing Orders – show of hands. Thank you. Standing Orders accepted.

Conference, just before we move on to Conference agenda, I would just like to invite Andy Hogg up on behalf of the Honorary Life Members.

ANDY HOGG – HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS REPRESENTATIVE: Thanks Chair. Good morning, Conference. I've got to say it's an absolute honour and a privilege to me, addressing and offering you the fraternal greetings on behalf of the Honorary Life Members and I'm absolutely delighted to be one of them, following this year's Annual Conference at Southport, and I thank you very much for that honour indeed. Of course this year it is tinged with a fair degree of sadness at the passing of John Shannon, as John pointed out as well. John has been a stalwart of this trade union for many a year and he'll be sadly missed as a colleague and a good friend for all those that knew him.

It seems incredibly for me, to be standing here three years on from the last time I stood here and addressed another Conference in between, and obviously in a very different capacity, and I was thinking about how much things had actually changed in that period, and of course the big thing was COVID that had obviously just started to come in as I was going out the door as well, thankfully, and I didn't have to deal with that. But what I do have to say is it's an absolute testimony to not only the branches and the membership in general, but the way that the prison officers have addressed that whole issue, it must have been one of the most dramatic things that I can ever remember coming into the service, and the degree in which they successfully managed that, and I've heard great stories about how they've managed the shortage of staff and everything else that came along with it, it's an absolute testimony to the degree of professionalism that this frontline operational service is, and what we do wish is that that will be properly recognised in the pay and the terms and conditions that you so rightly deserve. We want to see that going forward. Of course some things don't change that much and glancing through the agenda three years on I'm still looking at some of the things that I probably read out the last time I was standing up here. So things don't move an awful lot, and the slowness of our service to move at all, but each step we make is progress for this

organisation and progress for the membership and we're very grateful for that.

On behalf of the Honorary Life Members, can I thank you for your kindness and your hospitality and we wish you a very successful Conference.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks for that, Andy. Conference, just moving on to agenda, so motion 1 from Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Comforting to note the comments from the Chair about the direction that the POA's going to be taking, because it seems to support our motion. So the motion is that the POA seek that an Operational Lead payment be reinstated to recognise the work carried out by operational staff within every establishment and the allowance of shift disturbance and attendance at establishments. So what we're looking for is an operational lead because it's important for the members in the front line who attend an establishment out of normal working hours. And when we're speaking about that, we're speaking about increasingly covering escorts that GOA may fail to cover, or will pick up a fine rather than fulfil their duties, so in these situations staff have no way of knowing when a shift will finish, non-operational staff have quite rightly made a claim against equal pay against the operational lead, but it doesn't seem to be coming back the way when we've asked for on-call payments. That's the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference, do we have a seconder for the motion?

Shotts. Shotts, do you wish to speak? OK. Just to bring to Conference's attention, if motion 1 is passed, then motion 3 will fall, because it's encapsulated within this motion. Anyone else? Al, you wish to speak?

ALAN STUART – BRANCH SECRETARY, SHOTTS: Our motion,

motion 3, reads that the SNC reaffirms and continues to seek and negotiation with SPS on unsociable hours allowance for all operational staff. Obviously as Grampian said, the Chairman's address has covered most of what we wanted to say, and we were going to withdraw the motion. I just want to reiterate the work that the operational staff did, they worked through thick and thin for many years, they've turned up no matter what to deal with Scotland's hardened criminals, and as we know, they work weekends, night shifts and they work Christmas when other workers would expect time off, so I just wanted to reiterate that we should all support Grampian's motion and I also wanted to say what John covered earlier, about other our workers in the SPS, mostly office-based workers; they do a valuable job but, as John mentioned, with all due respect, they don't work weekends and night shifts and they don't deal with violent, unpredictable situations which result in them staying on beyond their finishing times. They don't start before everyone else and finish after everyone else, so please support Grampian's motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thans Shotts. Any other speakers? Jim McCabe for SNC.

JIM McCABE – VICE CHAIR, SNC: Chair, Conference, SNC support Grampian's motion for everything that's been said in John's address, and that Grampian and Alan have said. If we concede to have a job evaluation revisited, this will help us to achieve this. SNC's already started to work behind the scenes, spoken with lawyers, we've researched the various archives and the paperwork that described operational and non-operational jobs away back in the day. We've researched putting the ops and non-ops into families, is how it's described, and if we achieve this, we'll achieve the job evaluation. I don't want to go over old ground, but everything so far said is absolutely true. During COVID, operational staff covered gaols 365 days a year, 24 hours a day. The non-ops staff, and this isn't a slight on the non-ops staff, they do a decent job: they don't do our

job. We've got to be recognised, and therefore, on the basis of that, Conference, SNC ask you to support Grampian's motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Grampian, you wish to reply?

No, OK. Card vote, all in favour of the motion. Motion's passed.

Motion 2, Grampian.

KENNY CAMBELL – BRANCH SECRETARY, GRAMPIAN: Conference, honoured guests, motion 2 reads The POA seek the SPS to reintroduce shift allowances to distinguish between operational and non-operational staff and recognise the impact that working shifts has on staffs' wellbeing and personal/home life. We feel that the difference is quite significant. A lot of us here will have missed kids' first day at school, parents' evenings, weekends, maybe kids playing football etc. That's a distinct difference between ourselves and our non-operational colleagues, and if we look at other employers, civil service employers like the Border Force, who've got comparable terms and conditions, they get up to a 38% shift allowance. A member of staff in the Border Force earning £32,000 a year can get up to an extra £12,160 because of their shift allowance. Be sure that our members deserve that as well. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Do we have a seconder? Shotts. Shotts, do you wish to speak?

ALAN STUART – BRANCH SECRETARY, SHOTTS: No.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Anyone else wishing to speak? Jim McCabe on behalf of SNC.

JIM McCABE – VICE CHAIR, SNC: Chair, Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC. Chair, we would ask Grampian if they would accept a remit on the motion and allow us to

pursue and achieve motion 1 for all operational staff. The wording on this is talking about a shift; not all operational staff work shifts. Some operational staff, industries programmes etc. are 8 to 5, Monday to Friday predominantly, and it may adversely affect them, but if Grampian would allow us a remit to work on motion 1, then it would be all operational staff.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Grampian, do you accept the remit?

KENNY CAMBELL – BRANCH SECRETARY, GRAMPIAN: Yes.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference, do you accept the remit? Yes, thank you.

Motion 4, Dumfries.

Conference, do you accept that permission to withdraw?

Yes. Motion 5, Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Conference, please accept my tardiness for the first motion. Chair, motion 5, that the association actively pursues at least the same rates of T&S and Mileage payments as other Prison Services and government agencies in the UK, and that the 80-mile limit be removed given the increase in fuel and energy costs. As the Chair has already stated, the cost-of-living crisis that we're all living through, this, mileage payments, hasn't been looked at for a number of years, so following the application of the adjusted rate on 1st April '22, applicable to the UK government, within the HMRC, expenses, benefits, business travel mileage for employees, your own vehicle, rules for tax, government UK, has allowances of uplift to 10,000 miles per annum at 45p rate, and not at 80 miles. Also the additional mileage over 10,000 miles is at 25p and not, as we currently see, 12 pence. 12p per mile in the average family car would not cover the cost of fuel used, and if they were to hire a vehicle they would pay for the hire of the vehicle and the cost of fuel used and this should be what's

available to our members, and it doesn't take into consideration wear and tear of the vehicle either, so we'd ask you to support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Do we have a seconder? Dumfries. Dumfries, do you wish to talk? No. Anyone else wishing to respond to the motion? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks Conference. We're going to ask you to support the motion. The background and the circumstances that have just been outlined by Chris from Gampian, actually Motion 4 from Dumfries has just been withdrawn, actually it was going to cover the same thing and that might be the reason why you've withdrawn it. We've less control over being able to deal with that because it sits with HMRC. This one we have got far more control and the 80 mile limit isn't HMRC controlled, it's SPS and it's certainly something that we're happy to take forward if Conference approves the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Grampian, wish to reply? No. Conference, do we accept the motion? OK.

Motion 6, Low Moss.

DOUGIE MUIR – BRANCH DELEGATE, LOW MOSS: Motion 6 reads Ex-Gratia payments should be paid independently into staff bank accounts directly after the claim has been submitted and approved. Colleagues, if our members hadn't been disadvantaged so much with regards to the submission dates and timescales that the SPC laid down for ex-gratia, this motion wouldn't be necessary. As we all know, ex-gratia that our members earn is included with their salary on the last day of the month. The cutoff date for submitting it to payroll is within the first week of that month. This means that most of our members have to wait till the end of the following month, as much as eight weeks, to receive their money. Conference, this isn't acceptable. Ex-gratia isn't a salary, it's a form of payment for doing the employer a favour. That's the literal

translation for term ex-gratia. Our members shouldn't have to wait for up to eight weeks for doing the employer a favour. With modern technology, there is no reason why our members shouldn't receive money they're owed directly after it's earned. Conference, please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Low Moss. Do we have a seconder to the motion? Shotts. Shotts, do you wish to speak?

SHOTTS: No

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Anyone else wishing to speak? John Devine for SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Conference, the SNC are against this motion, we're asking you to reject it. Although we are fully aware of the delays and the problems within the current process, we do not see this motion providing a workable solution. Within any process that involves paying money into an employee's bank account, there must be a number of checks and balances to ensure that accurate and legitimate claims are paid. We have been given assurances that the employer is working on an updated process within the context of the digital transformation package. This should provide an efficient solution to the ongoing issues. So on that note, we would ask you to reject the motion, and let's give the employer the opportunity to rectify the current issues. Thanks Conference.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Low Moss, right to reply. No? OK. All those for, all those in favour of the motion. All those against. Motion's lost.

Motion 7, Low Moss.

MALKIE McKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Motion 7 reads Ex-Gratia worked on recognised public holidays should be paid at a weekend rate. Colleagues, with ex-gratia, SPS pay an enhanced rate for weekends as they realise how valuable weekends are to our members. Public holidays are just as valuable and just like

weekends, are generally spent in the company of family, friends etc. and so in essence are no different. It's only right that if our members are giving up quality time away from their family and friends, that they're compensated accordingly. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Low Moss. Do we have a seconder for that motion? Castle Huntly. Castle do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? John Devine on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Conference, on this occasion the SNC are asking you to support the motion from Low Moss. It's only right that our members are reimbursed with a reasonable and appropriate rewards for working over and above their contracted hours on a public holiday. Working those extra hours benefits the employer as it assists in maintaining the required staffing levels that contribute to the safety and security of the prison regime. So on that note, we are inclined to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks John. Low Moss, right to reply? No. All those for the motion. Any against? Motion's passed.

Motion 8, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH DELEGATE, EDINBURGH: Chair, Conference, the motion reads part time staff be paid the enhanced hourly rates for any ex-gratia over the contract hours. They should not be required to work the full 37 hours ... paid the higher rate. This was brought to me by part-time staff. They feel that they should be paid the full rate, they work the same as full-timers. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Edinburgh. Looking for a seconder for that motion? No seconder. Motion falls.

Motion 9, Grampian.

KENNY CAMPBELL – BRANCH SECRETARY, GRAMPIAN: Conference,

honoured guests, motion reads that The POA seek that an on-call allowance be paid to operational staff who place themselves on an on-call list at establishment level to reflect the payments made to our colleagues in estates and senior management. The remuneration for this is to be commensurate with that paid out to non-operational and Senior Management Team Staff.

From 1st April 2022, the estate's on-call policy, if a member of staff on the estates put themselves on call for a period of a week, 7 days, they be paid an extra £119.86 or the equivalent of £17.12 a day. It was based on 12-month percentage change in the Retail Price Index, published by the ONS. We are increasingly having to put staff out, out of hours, to cover escorts or call them in to cover escorts that aren't picking up. We feel it's only fair that rather than just rely on the good will of staff, that they should be recompensed for placing themselves in that position and being called in. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Do we have a seconder for this motion? Castle Huntly. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else to speak? No. Mark Meikle for SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Chair, Conference, speaking on behalf of SNC and I'm speaking against this motion. I sought some clarity from Grampian prior to their coming to get exactly what they wanted from the motion, and as you'll all probably be aware, there is an SOP in place for all establishments to have a list that people volunteer to go on, and then they can then be called for short-notice escorts. The current arrangement that we have, has no commitment to be contractable or indeed for you to cover such shifts. It's purely on a voluntary basis. If this was introduced and we had an allowance, it would come with a commitment for you to be on standby for a determined period of time and a commitment to attend duty when asked. Currently, if it was the same over the estates it would be seven days, so for seven days, you would be expected to put

your life on hold for what we believe is a small amount of money. Some staff may be prepared to do this. However, we believe that the majority would not. Therefore if you are unwilling to put your name on standby and be available for a 7 days you would not be offered any of the ex-gratia that would come up short notice. Therefore we believe it would be to the detriment of the majority of the members. Please reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Mark. Grampian, right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? All those against? Motion's lost. Motion 10, Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Conference, Chair, motion 10, that this association actively pursues enhanced compensation for those staff who have had to cover hospital watches and escorts out of contracted timeframes, and enhanced payments for those staff covering the shortfall within establishments. So it's not just the staff that we're losing from the operational frontline, who are covering GEOAmeey escorts that they fail to provide service for. It's also the frontline staff from residential areas that are being taken out, we should be giving some sort of compensation or the staff should be provided with compensation for covering these additional escorts. I remember a time when the Scottish Prison Service covered all our own escorts and we managed that, and we had staff built into the complements where we could provide emergency escorts. That's not the case now that the SPS no longer provides escorts in that manner, but increasingly, especially in HMP Grampian, we are providing escorts for a contract that doesn't seem to be working for us. I would urge you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Do we have a seconder? Shotts.

JOHN DIXON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Fully supporting this motion. As you know, those who've been at Conference, we've been fighting this for a number of years. This came into place as emergency escorts. It's now every escort, every single day, every single

night we're putting people, taking them off their post and going out onto escorts and we're not back filling. There's no process in place, when we take staff off, there's no restrictions in place. Staff are basically getting taken off their posts, putting us down below minimum agreed safe staffing levels and nobody from SPS is actually doing anything at all about this. Year after year after year we've come to this Conference and we've mentioned this. It is ridiculous, what's happening, and these staff, if this is the only way we can get the SPS to listen, we'll start paying the staff to go. And we also need nurses that are at their establishments that know, when they're doing a triage, when they actually have to go out on these escorts. A sore thumb, a cut above the eye, a toenail off, all gone on emergency escorts. It's ridiculous! Please support this motion, colleagues.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts. Anyone else wishing to speak? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks colleagues. What you've just heard both from Grampian and from Shotts is a long-running, long-standing issue that's existed with us in the service for a long time. You've just a description of the kind of impact it has in the service, so we agree with every word of that and we recognise the issues that it comes with. What we're going to ask you to do is to remit this motion, though. There are two reasons for that. The first one is probably to do with the language in the motion, which, at one point, talks about compensation and in the next point about enhanced payment, so potentially that leads to two different outcomes for two different groups of staff. So we've got an issue with the wording on it. The far bigger issue for us, though, and why we want a remit rather than a straightforward acceptance is we don't want this to be seen as the solution to the problem. The problem is a much more profound and deeply felt issue than being able to put money towards the staff who are in this circumstance. The issue needs to be addressed between ourselves, the SPS and the contract providers,

to make sure that you finally address the issues that are coming from it. So we'd ask you to remit it, allow us to pursue that based on the principle of the motion coming forward in that way. But actually the far bigger issue is that we produce a more sustained long-term solution to this problem, which shouldn't be dealt with in the way that this motion's asked us to do it. So we'd ask you to accept a remit.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Grampian, do you accept the remit? Conference, accept the remit? Yes, that's been remitted, thank you.

Motion 11, Barlinnie.

AUSTIN O'CONNOR – BRANCH SECRETARY, BARLINNIE: Motion 11 reads Conference instructs the SNC to have all C, D and E operational staff group paid RR allowance given the staff shortages within the operational group of the SPS. Conference, given the current situation of the problems trying to recruit and even retain frontline operational staff, coupled with the fact that the allowance is already being paid to some other employees, it's only fair that we seek to introduce this allowance for our members. It may go some way to solving the ongoing issues with recruitment and the retention of staff. Colleagues, please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Barlinnie. Do we have a seconder for that motion? Low Moss. Low Moss wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? William Reid on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIAM REID – FINANCE OFFICER, SNC: Chair, Conference, responding on behalf of the SNC. Conference, we ask you to support this motion. Colleagues, when the retention and recruitment allowance was introduced, we were told that we had a shortage of suitable candidates wanting to join the SPS and there was a real threat of a mass exodus of senior management leaving the organisation. Let us also not forget that we were told that this allowance was non-consolidated. Colleagues, at this moment in time, we're heading towards an overall 4% shortage in all our operational

grades. This is best-case scenario. The SPS is struggling to attract individuals to join the organisation, resulting in lower intakes than planned. The SPS regularly release emails or brochures showing us our new headquarters and how the new HQ offers the opportunity for flexible and home working for all that will work there. Great for our non-operational colleagues. Not great for our operational colleagues. So it comes as no surprise that they feel ignored and disillusioned with the SPS. A case of in this together, but only for some. A frightening consequence of individuals leaving the SPS is that in a recent intake of 30 plus new recruits, this only resulted in a real-term circa plus 2 in the overall numbers of operational officers in the SPS. Colleagues, if you cast your mind back, I bet, like me, you can't say you witnessed the same scenarios amongst the senior management teams, but the SPS used this as a justification to introduce RR&A for that group of staff. The SPS should recognise and award operational officers appropriately. Colleagues, please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks William. Barlinnie, right to reply? No. All in favour of the motion. Any against? Motion passed.

Motion 12, Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Conference, Chair, motion 12: Conference mandate the SNC to seek that all additional hours to contracted work be paid at enhanced rates of a minimum 1.6 for Monday-Friday and a minimum of double time for weekends in recognition of the additional hours contracted. The cost-of-living crisis that we live through, nothing has changed for the Scottish Prison Service, everything seems to remain the same. Mileage stays the same, extra hours stays the same, additional work for the Scottish Prison Service with no recognition stays the same. So there's status quo. Right now we're being paid 1.3 for Monday to Friday for ex-gratia and having to wait several weeks to get that payment, and then sometimes you're getting that ex-gratia payment on top of other

payments that you would have had because of the delay getting paid, which then incurs additional tax for our members. No fault of their own, but they don't seek to have anything special, only what they're due. So we're looking to get 1.6, as we've got for the weekend at present, Monday to Friday, and double time for weekends, and I would urge you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Do we have a seconder for that motion? Perth. Perth, wish to speak? No. Anyone else? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Conference, we're going to ask you to reject the motion, and this time it is based entirely on the wording of the motion. There's none of us would have difficulty if this motion had stopped at the word weekends, and we'd have gladly taken that on and pursued it on behalf of the membership, but as those of you who've been coming to Conference long enough will remember, the last part of that motion talks about in recognition of the additional hours contract; there is no additional hours contract, and in fact it's been brought to Conference twice formally to get us around that pass and we've overwhelmingly rejected it both times that it's come to the Conference, so had the motion stopped at weekends we'd have gladly supported the motion, but you're asking us now to take something forward in recognition of something that doesn't exist. And it not only doesn't exist, it's been overwhelmingly rejected twice by Conference to do it on a contract basis, so in a word, we're going to ask you to reject it.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Grampian, right to reply? All those for the motion. All against. Motion falls.

Motion 13, Dumfries.

BRIAN ALISON – BRANCH DELEGATE, DUMFRIES: Chair, Conference, motion reads that the SNC negotiate with the employer to have any extra hours worked towards TOIL,

then these should be paid back at the same rate as ex-gratia, for example 1.3 Mon-Fri & 1.6 on the Saturday/Sunday. I'm sure due to all the shortages that we've had, due to a number of reasons, sickness, a lot of it to do with recruitment, etc. we've certainly seen a huge increase in TOIL hours. Is there any reason why our members shouldn't be paid back at that same rate as ex-gratia? It must be saving the service a fortune if they were getting people in working for another when they could be paying ex-gratia.

Although we all know the problems in getting some of that TOIL back, I think it's only fair that our members deserve that payment. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Dumfries. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Grampian. Grampian, you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Karen Ewen on behalf of the SNC.

KAREN EWEN – SNC: Colleagues, we ask you to reject this motion. It could be more detrimental to our members and quite frankly unachievable. TOIL is purely a system used by employers for a straight time-for-time compensatory basis with no premiums attached. It is not a like-for-like system. Asking to negotiate this with the employer would introduce a whole new system which could be restrictive and increasingly difficult to manage. For example, if you work TOIL on an enhanced rate day, you'd be limited to negotiating those hours back, whereas at the moment, if you work TOIL for a weekday you can request that time back, on an enhanced rate day. The same can be said for banked hours. If you owe the SPS hours, they do not have the right to request that you pay it back on that same day. If our members want to ensure they get the time back of the hours they worked, that could be up to them to negotiate to get those hours back on the required time. Conference, the SPS do not legally have to offer TOIL, but we all recognise the value and flexibility it offers. To pass this motion could be more restrictive

than beneficial to our members, and on that basis, we ask that you reject this motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Karen. Dumfries, right to reply? Conference, all in favour. All those against. Motion's lost.

Motion 14's a composite, moved by Dumfries and seconded by Edinburgh.

ALISTAIR WILSON – BRANCH SECRETARY, DUMFRIES: Motion 14 reads that the SNC enter negotiations with the SPS to ensure that all enhanced holiday pay is paid automatically rather than an individual having to apply as at present. When we discussed this with the members, an overwhelming majority of them didn't know what enhanced holiday pay was, didn't know how to apply for it, didn't know where the paperwork was, didn't know anything about it. It would appear that this payment, although it's an entitlement, is the best kept secret that the SPS has. Therefore the motion is asking that this enhanced holiday pay is paid automatically to all members, not just people that apply. I think as it's an entitlement and it's more money, the membership have been let down by the SPS with regards to the information that it requires to actually apply for it, trying to negotiate SharePoint is a minefield at the best of times, but trying to find the form for this is even worse. We ask you to support the motion please.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Dumfries. Edinburgh?

Chair, Conference, I support this motion

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH DELEGATE, EDINBURGH: I support this motion. This payment be missed. It can save the SPS hundreds of thousands of pounds, and I support it. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Edinburgh. Any other speakers? Mark Meikle on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Chair, Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC In favour of this motion. The delegates that were up speaking before were perfectly right. What happened with this, and a lot of people don't know, is that five years ago, in 2017, an employment tribunal appeal claim was won. This was external to SPS and it was that employees who work overtime get enhanced holiday pay to compensate loss of earnings due to not being able to work overtime when on leave. The SPS accepted that we would have to pay this to keep within employment law. A claim form was created which can be found in SharePoint, when you go to Annual Leave Policy, then you go to Claim Forms and down the bottom in small print, that's where you can find the application form. The form is particularly complicated to complete, you can claim up to 20 days but must claim within 90 days of taking leave; therefore multiple claims have to be made. If you do not claim it within 90 days you lose it. It's calculated on your previous year's ex-gratia, worked at 7.4 for the first 20 days' leave that you take in that year. Some people believe it's been made so complicated just to put people off claiming it. It would, obviously, be better for the members if this was done by Pay Section on their behalf even if you simply informed them once you had taken 20 days' leave. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Mark. Dumfries? All those in favour of the motion. And against? Motion's passed.

Motion 15, Barlinnie.

AUSTIN O'CONNOR – BRANCH SECRETARY, BARLINNIE: Motion 15 reads Conference mandates the SNC to seek an increase to the allowance for dirty campaign and dealing with incontinent prisoners. Colleagues, I think this is a straightforward motion. We feel that the rate is not reflective of the disgusting and unpleasant conditions that we, as staff, are expected to work in. As the SPS notes in the policy statement that exposure is out with the normal range of duties, we believe

an increase in allowance should be considered. Colleagues, please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Barlinnie. Seconder, Shotts.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Fully supporting this motion. Colleagues, I don't know about you, but what we're getting now is we're getting more and more frail, infirm, incontinent, like myself, in the prison service in this moment in time. It's not just dirty protests that we're dealing with, it's people who can't get out of bed, can't get up, we've got carers coming in. HMP Shotts is slowly moving towards a care home facility. It's getting to the stage where this is not just going to be a one-off, it's going to be the future. This is a time to get this in and get supporting Barlinnie's motion so that we get people paid for these things. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts.

PHIL THOMAS – BRANCH DELEGATE, SPS COLLEGE: Chair, SNC, Conference, fully supporting the motion. Contacted the police officers who deal with similar situations, they'll have contractors within their cells difference, but police actually get a special payment if they have to go into, it's not part of their contract but dirty conditions, and the minimum is a £50 payment for a one-off. So I think it's something that the prison service need to look at and hopefully these guys can pursue that, thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you. Any more speakers? John Devine for SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Chair, Conference, the SNC are asking you to support the motion from Barlinnie. It's only right that a trade union seeks to increase allowances that are paid to its members. The motion is also flexible and it does not tie us to a specific figure. This is helpful for the negotiators. The reasons for stating the increase, it's not just due to the unpleasant environment, but it's also to seek an

increase to all allowances. The moving branch did say about it being out with the normal range of duties. However, it is foreseeable, and Shotts branch mentioned that it's becoming more and more common, so here we have another contractual difference, so the SNC are supporting this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks John. Barlinnie, right to reply? All those for. And against? Motion's passed.

Motion 16, Perth.

ANDY BROWN – BRANCH CHAIR, PERTH: Chair, Conference, people, this one again it goes back to some of the ones cost-of-living. Future pay deals are settled by 1st April as stated in pay policy so that pay points and increments are paid on time, as per terms and conditions. We've got a young lad that works for us, who's due to jump up on his pay band, on his increment. Can't get it because it's not been settled. It's a major difference on what the guy can apply for his mortgage. Major difference. Until it's been settled he can't apply for it. And there's more and more inconsistencies that, as per policy, all increments should come into effect on 1st April. SPS, they just keep it because they've got to do a wee bit extra work to backdate it when they get it. It should come in when we do it, so I'm asking you to support the motion, make sure our colleagues get paid their increments when they should be paid. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Perth. Have a seconder? Castle Huntly. You wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Yes, Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Sorry, but I didn't take note of the governor's action notice that was included recently in the pay deals, but I think it's absolutely ludicrous that staff and members waiting for their increments have got to wait for a pay deal to be negotiated which always runs on over many months and staff who are waiting, quite rightly, for that increment to be paid to them, because they've naturally

progressed into that point in the service, shouldn't have to wait for that pay deal to be resolved to get that increment. I would urge you to support that motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Shotts?

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair Conference, going to ask you to reject this motion, although it's painful because we've had colleagues coming into the office asking us about their next spine point, when they're going to get it. It's been constant since this pay negotiation, but that's the thing, it's pay negotiation, it's part of the pay negotiations and if we stick it to the 1st of April, that means that the pay negotiation could end up being delayed until 1st April and whatever's on the table we'll have to go with. So for that angle, I'm looking at the motion and while I understand the spirit of the motion, it's not a given as it stands just now that they get an increment. It's part of the pay negotiation. So on that basis, I ask you to reject it.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Shotts. Any other speakers? Phil Fairlie for the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY, SNC: Thanks Colleagues. We are also going to ask you to reject the motion. It's a motion that comes to this Conference every two or three years and we know why it comes, we know what motivates the branches that bring it to Conference and ask us to try and get their pay settled from 1st April. We would love to get the pay settled on that date every year if we could, but if you pass this motion, and it's a term that you've heard used every time it's come to Conference, you're tying the hands of the negotiators and it means that we are left with whatever happens to be on the table come that date, and I just ask you to put yourselves on the other side of the table if you were negotiating on behalf of the other side, knowing that the mandate for this trade union is that you settle on whatever's on the table on 1st April. So we recognise the frustration, we recognise why it comes to

Conference as often as it does, but had we had that in place this year, we'd be sitting with a 2% pay rise. Given what's going on in the current climate, you know what the reaction to that was going to be. So it's not in our interests to put us in a position where we are hogtied by a deadline of a time when negotiators on the other side of the table are well aware of what that timeline is. We are still actively pursuing right now, while we're sitting here at Conference, an outcome for this year's pay deal, and you know yourselves the stages it's gone through to get to where we are at the moment. We still don't have it, the cost-of-living crisis that was mentioned with Perth is absolutely right, everybody's going through. The solution to that isn't to have to take what's on the table on 1st April. The solution to that is getting the very best deal that you can from the negotiation process. That's what we're involved in just now. That cost-of-living crisis isn't going away. Within weeks we'll be back to the table for next year's pay deal doing the same again. So please do not tie the hands of the negotiators and give us an opportunity to get in there and get the very best deal that we can in the circumstances that we're facing.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Phil. Perth, right to reply?

ANDY BROWN – BRANCH CHAIR, PERTH: I understand what Phil's saying, but at the end of the day when they come back 1st April and they offer, we don't have to accept the offer, we could still reject it. But what we're looking for is the pay points they get paid for that annual increment that should come in on 1st April, Phil. That's not the actual accepting the pay deal, but that's what the opinion behind it was for the motion.

Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Perth. All in favour of the motion. All against. Motion's lost.

Motion 17. It's a composite where the movers are actually the SNC and the seconders are Shotts, so Karen Ewen on behalf of the SNC.

KAREN EWEN – SNC: Chair, Conference, we, the SNC, would like to put on record and show our appreciation to all our colleagues who worked tirelessly on and off the frontline against coronavirus. You should be commended for the way you severely reduced the impact of coronavirus within the prison service. Compared to the care homes and hospitals throughout the country, our numbers were relatively low, and we were not affected as badly, and that is all down to the work that you all did. The personal commitment and dedication shown by everyone has been nothing short of remarkable. Families were either separated or put at risk so you could carry on and come to work. Working on the frontline, the high measure of dignity and respect and of course forgotten about by the media and the public, as we so often are. We overcame practical and emotional challenges, found new ways of working, played a vital role in protecting the safety and wellbeing of everyone. The approach and flexibility you have all shown as a disciplined, professional people to support and deliver essential services to those in our care and each other is something to be truly proud of. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Karen. Shotts.

ALAN STUART – BRANCH SECRETARY, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference, SNC, I just want to reiterate what Karen said. The COVID pandemic is a prime example of the continued commitment, hard work and sacrifice of operational staff within the SPS. They came into work, not only changing shift patterns and giving up their work-life balance, but also risking their lives in order to maintain a safe and secure running regime. These staff are visible every single hour of every single day, dealing with deaths, blood-soaked suicide attempts, drug-induced unrest, mental and physical assaults and their own fatigue, all under the risk of contracting this killer virus. We should be proud of our members throughout all of this. The strength of solidarity and the support for each other was second to none and they should be recognised for going

above and beyond, not just for doing their jobs but for the sacrifices operational frontline staff made throughout and continue to make right now. The SPS should also thank their staff by supporting our pay demands, by sitting down with the government and explaining why we realistically need it and why they're proud of us. Conference, hopefully there's a hope that all branches will be able to come up here and say something today in support of our staff, who did so much throughout the pandemic. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Shotts. Anyone else wishing to speak on the motion?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, Conference, I'm in favour of this wholeheartedly. The SPS should be bending over backwards to help us out, because we kept the service running. Everybody through that pandemic put an effort in to make sure that the SPS continued to function fully. We shouldn't be sitting down and having to batter out a pay negotiation. The SPS should be coming forward and saying, 'You did a grand job. Here's your reward. Thanks very much.' So support this motion, talk about this. This Conference, it's up to us to turn round and say to our employer sorry, we've done your hard graft, we continue to do the hard graft; you should be rewarding us for this. We shouldn't have to go cap in hand and keep saying go and get some scraps off the table. We should be getting a good wage for the job that we do. Thanks very much.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Dumfries.

BRIAN ALISON – BRANCH DELEGATE, DUMFRIES: It's really just to reiterate, we had a couple of years of this pandemic and our staff on the frontline did a tremendous job. One of the main things that sticks with me is that we've all seen what happened in care homes etc. in the communities and prisons were expected to go that same way and, as Karen pointed out, we were fortunate in the number of deaths we had in custody was very few compared to what the forecast was, and that

was down to the staff, to their flexibility, to their dedication and their commitment to their job and to the people in custody. So it's just a huge thank you and well done to everybody.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Dumfries. College/HQ?

PHIL THOMAS – BRANCH DELEGATE, SPS COLLEGE: Chair, SNC, Conference, not forgetting our College colleagues, getting people through Officer Foundation Programmes as well, the hard work that they did. We also recognise what prison officers did over the last two years. It's been remarkable. And it has saved lives, but also for our branch as well, to say thank you to our members, for getting people through the door to help the recruitment drive as well. So a big thank you to all the operational, frontline and us at the College as well. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak? All those in favour of the motion. Motion's passed.

Motion 18, Grampian.

Does Conference accept motion being formally moved? Thank you.

Waiting for a seconder for the motion. Barlinnie. Barlinnie, you wish to speak? No. Anyone else wishing to speak. Greenock.

DON MCGRORY – BRANCH DELEGATE, GREENOCK: Asking you to reject the motion. First of all it's not about self-preservation. I'm up for re-election in two years and I've got an unopposed but I'm not standing because seven years as the gaol misery Hoover is enough for me!

The best people to decide who the PLR is the branch committees. They're the guys that know the experience and the skills that people on the committees have got. We all know every branch has got a couple of guys in that send out the emotive emails and meetings are the ones that shout the loudest, but when you challenge them to come up with facts, you quickly realise

they're dumb-dumbnuts, right? Spouting absolutely nonsense. But the problem is, some people give these guys credence because they're shouting.

Now the problem with this motion, as I said, a lot of people give these people credence now. They're quite happy to shout from the sides, but they never stand for election, so when it comes to it, they have no experience, they have no skills that the guys that are coming onto the committee have, and the guys, unlike the PLRs, they're doing it mostly on their own time, and they work their backsides off with no rewards. These are the guys, when the committee sit round and decide who should be the best to do the PLR, that's the guys that should be picked to do the PLR, no somebody that's quite happy to sit from the sides. They never stand for election, by the way, these people. They're quite happy to sit from the sides now. If you're wanting the branches to vote to who becomes a PLR. Imagine that these are the ones that get put in as PLRs, imagine these are the ones that represent our members, these are the ones that's coming to National Conference. Not for me! National Conference, I've seen, and I've been coming to Conference for over 20 years, National Conference this year did in England was the worst motion I've ever seen in my time in there, and it was a motion where local branch committees don't pay their union dues. I've never seen a worse motion in my life. All you were going to get on that was a bunch of people who should never be anywhere near a committee, because they're only going to the committee to try and save a wee bit of money. So what you're going to get is if the branches vote for PLRs, and it's not a committee that votes for the PLRs, because they know the skills that these guys have got, all you're going to get is a committee full of pure dumb-dumbnuts. My personal opinion.

So, all I would say is leave it to the local branch committees to pick who should be the PLRs, because they're the guys that know the skill base that's within that committee to become the PLR. Please reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Greenock. Any other speakers. Willie Carle on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: Conference, we'd ask you to reject the motion, as the PLR post is a TUS position under partnership. We don't own it and it's not part of the POA Rules and Constitution. The PLR post was a conduit between management and unions, not just the POA. It was agreed as part of the partnership accords along with Prospect, PCS and Management. Any changes could only be made with there being agreement between the partners. At the start of partnership the POA were the only union with structures in place that could facilitate the PLR post. This has changed and now other unions can facilitate the post. The risk is now, if this motion is passed, we would need agreement from all the recognised unions. That would mean opening up the PLR post, not just for the POA. Then you have to put in time-limits for the post and agreements with other unions to fit the constitutions. By allowing all unions to vote for the PLR, it could take away HQ and [84:01] from the POA. As it stands, the PLR posts in all branches are held by POA Committee members. The local branch committees have been elected as part of the POA constitution. Your committees then decide working as committee who they feel is best for the PLR post. This allows flexibility to change as needed or share as a rotation post, giving the committee members a break if needed, as the PLR post carries a lot of pressure due to the workload. Don't forget, it's the committee members that understand the pressures and the workloads involved, not someone who's never been in the POS office or at a meeting fighting for the membership and never will. Remember, the membership pick the local branch committee members through a fair and open process. The branch committees have been given the authority to work in the committees' and members' best interests to decide who is the PLR. Colleagues, the POA do not have the right or authority to implement this motion and, as stated, we have a fair and democratic process in place that has worked

from the beginning of partnership. Therefore we're going to ask you to reject this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Willie. Right to reply, Grampian? All those in favour of the motion; all those against? Motion's lost.

Motion 19, Barlinnie.

MICK MULHOLLAND – BRANCH CHAIR, BARLINNIE: Chair, Conference, motion 19 reads Conference instructs the POA to put in place a mechanism that informs local branches of new membership applications. This will ensure consistency with the rules and constitution. Rule 7.4(A) which states 'the national executive committee may refuse membership to any applicant on the recommendation of the branch.' Colleagues, due to the move to the digital application, branches will appreciate the local branch committees need to know who are applying to join or in most cases rejoin the union. We know those who are in and out because they see trouble on the horizon and they can see that a visit to the fire brigade rehabilitation may be beneficial to their health. So to take the constitution Rule 7(A) recommendation of the branch committee, we ask you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Barlinnie. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Perth. Perth, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? John McCabe on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN MCCABE – SNC VICE CHAIR: Chair, Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC. We ask you to support the motion for just the reasons Mick pointed out. We know that people that's in the unions and only ever appear when there's a coding on the horizon or some sort of investigation, but the new online database will achieve this because the information will go and the local Branch Secretary will be contacted to say this person's wanting to rejoin, so we ask you to support the motion. Thanks very much.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks John. Barlinnie, right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? All those against? Motion's carried.

Conference, we're going to finish up there for lunch. Lunch is in the main dining room. Also there's express check-in now for those of you that haven't checked in, either before or after, and we'll start back at quarter-to-two prompt. Thank you.

<Lunch break>

POA Scotland Conference, 2022

TAYAV002 starts:

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference, if we can come to order, thank you. Just a couple of announcements before we move on. You'll notice a couple of table changes; it should have been done alphabetically this morning, but there was a wee issue, so there's been a couple of seat changes for those involved. Secondly, some of you have had *this* put on your tables. There was only 50 and there's more people here, so some folk have them and some folk don't. It's for the raffle, as you can see, for a bottle of Scotch and it's from Group Life. Those of you that do have it, if you fill out your details and when you are leaving, there's a basket at the back door, just in at your right-hand side as soon as you get out; if you just stick it in and we'll do a draw tomorrow. As I say, the winner will get the Scotch whisky and we'll just go into a wee bit of detail into Group Life, at the time of the raffle, tomorrow. Alright, thank you.

Motion 20, Edinburgh. Conference accept? Formally move? Can I have a seconder for the motion? No seconder? Perth. Do you wish to speak, Perth? Anyone else wishing to speak? William Reid on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIAM REID – FINANCE OFFICER: Conference, we are more than happy to reaffirm that on 16 March 2024, Serco will cease running the HMP Kilmarnock. It will then move into public ownership. This has been

confirmed by previous and current justice ministers and SPS management. Serco has also issued letters to its employees in HMP Kilmarnock to confirm this transfer also. Furthermore, the Assistant General Secretary, our Chairman and I are planning to visit to address our colleagues in Kilmarnock. I know I speak for all of us by saying we are looking forward not only to 16 March '24 but to a day when we have no privately owned prisons in Scotland. Colleagues, I hope this reaffirms to all, the future of HMP Kilmarnock will be in the public sector.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, William. Conference, as that was just to reaffirm, there'll be no card vote on that. Thank you.

Motion 21, Edinburgh. Conference accept that be formally moved? Can I have a seconder for the motion? No seconder. Motion falls.

Motion 22, Shotts.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference, motion 22, That Conference mandate the SNC to engage with the employer to create a new role for a resettlement or retirement support post either within college headquarters, ensuring there is support and guidance for those staff ahead of and in preparation for leaving the job. Colleagues, in the last wee while, we've had ... we're at a certain age group that I joined the service with, that are starting to retire and leave the job. And we've also got people who are suffering all sorts of serious illnesses that they can no longer continue in the role. But one of the things that I'm finding is happening more and more is that there is nobody that they can go to, to seek any help or understanding or any of the processes and procedures that relates to them leaving the job and what actually happens. There's nothing in place that can actually ... you can go to somebody and say, 'Well, what happens in week one, week two or week three of my retirement?' 'What can I expect to happen?' 'How long is it going to take?' etc. Not a thing is in place for them, so staff are coming back to me and as a union, not

the employer; they're coming back to the union and asking, 'What happens next?' What do they do? What does it mean for them? And what we're finding, colleagues, is that these staff at times are distraught and they're unsure and they're left to their own devices to try and go through a minefield of confusion where they try to phone MyCSP, DWP etc., and what's actually happening is, they're on the phone from anywhere between 30, to 2 hours, to try and get in contact with someone and what's actually coming to light out of this is, if they do get through, they're getting someone who goes, 'Actually, I don't really know the answer to that, you need to go to your employer.' So, if they're all that time waiting etc. and they're going back to their employer who goes, 'No, it's MyCSP and DWP that deal with you.' So, there seems to be a disconnect. I'm ex-forces, and we had a resettlement officer when I came out the army and what they actually did was they had a library of things set up for you that had information packs, that had your local councils where you were going to go and live etc., and they took my job details of what I did in the army, which wasn't always killing people, but they took my experience and they turned it into civilian life and told you what you could actually carry out. All I'm looking for here is for the employer to not throw these people on the scrap heap because they've gone out the door. I want the employer to actually take cognisance that the fact is people are lost in transit and they don't know where to go and they don't know what to do and even the employer themselves keep passing it to local HR teams to ... *The H team*, I think they're called, so it seems to be getting bounced from pillar to post. So, I'm just asking, please support this motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you, Shotts. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Castle Huntly. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Willie Carle on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: Conference, we'd ask you to support this motion. As it stands, members in these situations, who are looking

for support or find it hard to get any information or help and what they do get sometimes is wrong or conflicting. What is needed is guidance with clear and concise information that's factual. A role like this is essential for our members to help and support them during life changing events, and achieving this role is a positive step for our members that will help reduce any anxiety or stress. Therefore, Conference, we'd ask you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Willie. Shotts, right to reply.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: No, thanks.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: OK. All those in favour? Motion's carried. Conference, just going to take a small pause from the agenda and invite our National Chair, Mark Fairhurst, up to address Conference. Thanks, Mark.

MARK FAIRHURST – NATIONAL CHAIR: John, Chair, Scottish National Committee, delegates, friends, this is the first opportunity I've had to congratulate everyone on the SNC. I notice a lot of new faces and a lot of new delegates out there that are coming to Conference for the first time. It's really good to be back and I'm so pleased that I've brought the Scottish weather with me, from Liverpool. It never lets us down, does it? So, well done; you're doing a great job. And most of all, I just want to thank each and every one of you in this hall for the absolutely commendable work you all do and have done for the past two years. I know how difficult it's been. We've all been through the same experience, going into work without protection during a pandemic. There was no blueprint for a pandemic and no contingency plans, but we got on with it, didn't we? Putting our families at risk, putting our own health and safety at risk, because nothing was in place. And they were really difficult times, but what we proved, not only to governments north of the border and south of the border, but to the general public, what we proved is how essential our role is and how good are we at our job. And we deserve all the

praise that's thrown at us. We didn't get any headlines. We just did it under the radar, but I know how difficult it is, and COVID; it's affected every single one of us. I doubt there's a single person in this room who doesn't know someone who's contracted COVID or has got a relative who's got COVID or had COVID. It's affected every aspect our lives. And now we've got to live with it. And I know on a smaller scale, you're getting through that now; we've still got outbreaks in England and Wales. We're getting more and more staff going absent with COVID-related illness over the past few weeks, because it seems to be ramping up again. And our employer in their wisdom have decided that, to align with the rest of the Ministry of Justice, and in line with NHS England, that they're planning on removing the COVID sick exemption at a time when winter is approaching and more and more of our staff are going sick because of COVID and we've said, 'It makes no sense. We're a unique workforce, in a unique environment.' And as we all know, any disease that comes into our prisons spreads like wildfire. So, we've said, 'Look, just review it next year sometime, let's get through winter and staff won't have to worry about coming in to work because they're about to go on half-pay or nil pay;' because, let's be honest, with the cost-of-living crisis, if you're about to go on half-pay or nil pay, and you've got COVID symptoms, you're not staying at home if you don't get a sick excusal are you? You're coming into work; you're putting everybody else at risk. But our employer just doesn't seem to get it at all. So, we wait to see what the outcome of that consultation is, because obviously if they want to impose it, they will and we'll advise our members accordingly. We'll just bombard them with grievances and sick leave excusal applications, but we'll see where that takes us. And I know you're experiencing similar things to what we've experienced for the past five to ten years, really, with more and more drugs coming into your prisons. And I know Spice was a particular problem and that's why you went to photocopying prisoners' mail. We've been doing that for some time now. Really successful. We've just adopted your model of

security at the gate, that you've had for years, but drugs still get in. And funnily enough, we had over a hundred million pounds invested in security at the gate; the body scanners and the X-ray machines. Well, the X-ray machines, surprise, surprise, haven't arrived yet, because there was a problem with procurement, because our employer just can't get a damned thing right. So, we're still waiting for X-ray machines and some jails now, because again of what you're experiencing in Scotland; some jails now, can't commit to security at the gate full-time, because they haven't got the staff to do it. So, what's the point of putting security at the gate, if you haven't got the staff to run it? And I know you're experiencing staffing shortages. I know you've got a problem recruiting staff. Our retention rates are absolutely abysmal. Just to put you in the picture, for at least the past four months now, we've had more staff leaving the job than we've had joining. And I don't know how we're going to get through that, because our employer's pinning all its hopes on the pay award that's just been imposed on us, which for some is really good. For new starters, they got an immediate £3,000 increase in salary, that amounted to an 18.5% pay rise. For middle managers, band fours and fives, they got about 7.5%, our operational support grades got 12. It's only the dinosaurs like me on closed grades, that got stiffed; 4%. But it was 4% more than I was expecting, as a closed grade. And the only reason we got such a decent pay rise for our younger members and those on new terms conditions, is because as a union, we challenged the government, we took them to court, because two years ago, during a pandemic, they refused to award what our pay review body had stipulated. They refused to give our members the £3,000 increase. They said it was unaffordable. Well, the country's in more of a mess now, financially, than it's ever been and they've just give us it, so that doesn't make any sense at all. And we're actually still lodged in the European Court of Human Rights, because that's how far we had to take it, because as usual the judiciary part of the establishment knocked us back on appeal, but we keep fighting. What are we after now, as we come out of the pandemic? As regimes open?

We're after *safe* regimes. And what we advocate in England and Wales, and what we say to our members and committees, is, 'Look, whether you like it or not, COVID regimes were a success; we protected people's lives and violence reduced, and there was less drugs in our jails.' That's because they were behind the doors more, so what we're saying now, as we open up, is, 'Don't go back to full wing unlock; just unlock a couple of landings at a time, give them their activities, bang them up and get the other couple of landings out.' Unlock small, manageable number of prisoners, so we've got a higher staff-to-prisoner ratio, and I'm hoping that gets through. I just mentioned there, the cost-of-living crisis, and just think about all the excuses that are thrown our way with the cost-of-living crisis; 'Well, it's down to the war in Ukraine,' 'It's down to the finances and the money we spent during the pandemic,' 'It's down to the furlough scheme, the money we had to borrow.' I'll tell you what it's down to, colleagues; it's down to a decade of austerity and below-inflation pay rises. That's why we're in a cost-of-living crisis. Because if we'd have hit inflation and above on every pay rise for the last ten years, we wouldn't be in a cost-of-living crisis. And there's a lot more that the governments can do, especially when it comes to our fuel bills. Why don't they just scrap VAT? Why don't they do what France did, and say, 'You can't increase prices, above 4%?' But they haven't done that and they try and kid us, don't they? The government tries to kid us that they've done us a favour by giving us a grant towards our energy bills. But our energy bills have doubled, so where is the favour? Things are that bad in England and Wales; we have some prisons, I kid you not, some prisons have opened their own food bank for staff. How bad is that? Food banks for staff in prison, in England and Wales! Liverpool City Council, this winter, are opening warm banks. So, in community centres and libraries in Liverpool, you can go and sit for a few hours and keep warm if you don't want to turn your heating on. That's how bad things have got. So, when the unions get slated, because they're balloting for industrial action and they're demanding a cost-of-living pay rise, why should we worry?

Because we deserve one; it's no good standing on your doorstep, clapping public sector workers, clapping prison officers at the front line, putting themselves at risk, because claps don't pay your bills. And that's why I'm so proud of each and every one of you and the Scottish National Committee, for all their efforts in trying to get you a cost-of-living pay rise. I know you've got a trade dispute in; I know you're probably going to ballot for industrial action. You've got the right to strike. Well let me tell you this, colleagues; I'm so very proud of that, I'm proud of you. And no matter what the weather is, if you decide you're going to hit the picket line, I'll be right there with you and so will my NEC. So, thanks for all your work, keep up the good work; we're right behind you, we've got your back. Solidarity.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks for that, Mark. Passionate as ever, and well received. Move on with the agenda. Motion 23, Barlinnie. Conference, formally move? Support for that? And we need a seconder for the motion. Castle Huntly. Wish to speak? Anybody else wish to speak? SNC have no speaker on this motion either, so we'll just go straight to vote. All those in favour of this motion? All those against? Any abstentions? Motion falls.

Motion 24, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, Conference, that this union ... send our support to our colleagues who work in the penal system in Ukraine. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Edinburgh. Do we have a seconder for this motion? Glenochil. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Jim McCabe on behalf of the SNC.

JIM MCCABE – SNC VICE CHAIR: Chair, Conference, we ask you to support the motion. We're all aware of the conflict in Ukraine and I

can only assume the added pressures on the prison staff in that area. Technically, we could send our support throughout the world, because there's prison staff in places like Syria, different areas in South America etc. But, however, the motion's asking us to support penal workers in Ukraine and I therefore ask you to support that motion, please.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Jim. Edinburgh, right to reply. Go to card vote. All those in favour of this motion? Any against? Motion's passed.

Motion 25, Low Moss.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Motion 25 reads, the Group Life insurance policy should be renegotiated with a view to enhancing the benefits for POA members. Conference, there's no doubt that Group Life has, and continues to be, a great benefit and resource to our members. However, its value over the years has diminished, and it's now important to revisit it, not just for our members, but their families also. Going back to the early 2000s, our members' monthly contributions to the scheme were around £8 per month for a benefit payout of £59,000. Today, it's doubled to around £16, yet it still only pays out £59,000. To put this into context, £59,000 in the early 2000s was equivalent of close to £100,000 in today's money. And that's money our colleagues' families are missing out on, should the worst happen. Also, if you remember, the scheme used to pay out for personal accident claims, such as a loss of limb or eye, and all of that's gone now. Colleagues, our members and their families deserve more. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Low Moss. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Grampian. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks, Conference. We're going to ask you to vote

against this motion. The reason we're going to ask you to vote against it, is simply that if we were to open up negotiations now to try and improve that scheme, there's absolutely no chance of being able to do that on the current cost. If we do it, we're going to increase the cost of the scheme, because there's no way we're going to get a benefit without it. The rise that Malky made reference to in the past, when it went up to 15.85 and kept at 59,000; that came about due to the activity in the scheme and the number of claims that had to be paid out over that period of time. It led to the scheme starting to not to become viable for the provider and they renegotiated with us, to get it up to that price. I can tell you right now, they would welcome a call from us right now, because we've just gone through an incredibly busy period, if I can frame it in that way, and the number of claims that we've had over the last two or three years, it's been one of the highest periods we've had for a while, of claims. Actually, we're sitting waiting on them contacting us rather than us contacting them looking to improve the scheme. When the circumstances are right, I can assure you we'll go back to try and renegotiate that contract and get better terms and conditions. The circumstances couldn't be worse than they are right now, in terms of holding that conversation. And if it is to improve the terms and conditions with an increase to the cost, I don't think the membership right now are going to thank us for that. We've all talked about it, and we'll talk about it for the next two days, I think; the austerity measures and the cost-of-living crisis that the members are going through. They're not going to take an increase in that scheme, and they're not going to thank us for it, if that's what we end up going to negotiate. Don't put us in a position where we go and have that conversation, because right now I don't think we can win that negotiation. John flagged up, when we started off Conference, the document that's sitting on your desk from the scheme provider. Carter Bond's outside the door. I would ask you to pick some of those leaflets, take them back to your branches. The one thing that would really help, in terms of holding that conversation, is

continue to sign up members to the scheme. We've had a lot of the membership who aren't members of the scheme and, as blunt as it sounds, we need to sign up much more of the younger members that we've got in the scheme, because that in itself changes the conversation that we have with the provider. So, for all those reasons, it's not that ... you know, 'Go and have a negotiation to improve the terms and conditions.' Of course, you would do that in any other circumstance. Circumstances just now are not a good time for us to make that call, so I'm going to ask you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Phil. Low Moss, right to reply. All those in favour of the motion? All those against? Motion is lost.

Motion 26, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, SNC, Conference, it's me again. 'Given the staff profile within the SPS and the percentage of these staff at the age where many are starting families, combined with the amount of flexible working applications refused due to not meeting business needs and the poor provision of childcare to accommodate shift workers within society, this Conference propose that the SNC enter into negotiations with the employer to provide an on-site, non-profit childcare facilities for the SPS.' When I first heard this, I was quite surprised, but then I understand where they're coming from. There's that many young families now, working for the SPS. And they're really passing their kids off in the car park, because they're doing an early shift or a back shift. What they're looking for, is somewhere where they can maybe meet up, to pass the kids over, instead of meeting in car parks or whatever. We do employ young families now and actually if one is doing a back shift or an early shift, I just feel please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Edinburgh. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Shotts. Shotts, to you wish to speak?

Anyone else wishing to speak? William Reid on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIAM REID – FINANCE OFFICER: Chair, Conference, colleagues, the SNC are asking you to support this motion. Colleagues, I personally brought a similar motion to our 2018 Conference, for much of the same reasons. And after just hearing from Edinburgh, the need for childcare facilities is even more pertinent and important. It's even more essential now that in this current financial climate, the lack of opportunities for flexible working for our operational colleagues, doesn't help, to say the least. I personally know about members who have had no alternative but to leave the SPS because of the lack of childcare; issues at home. It may surprise some, that organisations such as Next, Cisco, even Toyota UK, amongst others, offer onsite creche facilities at some of their offices. And I've done a wee bit of research about this, used the sort of magazines that HR and that, use. And I was reading one of these magazines, and recent article it actually says here, the HR managers of some of these companies were questioned over the benefits of offering such facilities to their employees. All had the similar responses; keeping good quality staff, attracting staff to the organisation. One manager said, having creche facilities or nannies can be a small expense relative to the potential benefits to their company as they recorded lower absenteeism and they also mentioned employee surveys came back with more positive comments about staff welfare. Surely, it's not too much for the SPS to look into this. So, colleagues, please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, William. Edinburgh, wish to reply? All those in favour? And any against? Motion is passed. Conference, just before we move on to 27, just a polite reminder; when you're coming up to the podium, for your name, position and establishment, just for record, if you don't mind. Thanks.

Motion 27, Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates, the motion reads that, ‘The SNC challenge the Scottish Prison Service on their interpretation of appropriate staff and staffing allocation levels in establishments. This is in light of the lack of adjustment to staffing complements to cover the additional leave after five years’ service, that is now affecting the establishment staffing.’ To give you a bit of background to this; myself and David did a bit of work on our staffing complement. We went back and, once we’d managed to get a hold of our staffing complement, found out that the staffing complement allocated for leave has a date attached to it of 2010, 2011, which says – and this is from Glenochil – that there is 28 staff who’s at C Band, that have the additional 5 days; there is 85 staff who’s at D Band that have 5 additional days and there is 2 E Bands with 5 additional days. The actual numbers for C, is 48 approximately. We don’t have the actual numbers because HR were reluctant to give us them. D’s, 136; and E’s, 28. Now, if you just take those numbers and actually total them up to the additional staff required, it would equate to an additional three operational staff, seven D Band staff and four E Band staff. That’s just to cover leave alone. That doesn’t even take into account some of the other things that members have spoken about, which is escorts, training ... I’m trying to think of some of the other ones that have come up ... agents’ bookings, all the additional roles and tasks that have been allocated to us over the last few years; over the 12 years that we’ve got this. When challenged on this, at a meeting, I was told ... and this is why it’s now a motion, that this was agreed by the director and the SNC, and this is not open for negotiation and, ‘If you wish to challenge it, Billy, bring it to a different forum.’ This is now the forum! So, over to the delegates. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Do I have a seconder to that motion? Perth. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Mark Meikle on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Chair, Conference, speaking in favour of this motion. Obviously, when it was won five years ago, that we qualified for 42 days after 5 years, that this would come at a cost. However, to my knowledge, the staffing complements have not been adjusted, properly anyway, in any establishments to properly effect this. If the motion is carried, we *will* challenge the SPS on this. There’s also several other issues with variable calculations which will be covered later, with other motions. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Mark. Glenochil? All those in favour? All those against? Motion is carried. Conference, it’s just been brought to attention that we’re a branch short following lunch, being Greenock. They’ve not come into the room. So, just for Conference, if you are content that we proceed in their absence? Yes. OK, thanks for that.

Motion 28, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, SNC, Conference, the motion reads, the SNC enter discussion with employers to ensure that new recruits do not go on the complement until they return from college. This is a massive problem with new recruits. As soon as they’re employed, we put them right on a landing; they’re right on our complement. We feel, as a branch, that when they do come back, they should maybe shadow our staff for a good month, to learn the job. They’re right in the landing, they’re new at their job. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Edinburgh. Do we have a seconder for this motion? Shotts.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference, supporting this motion. There’s another part to this motion, colleagues, that the fact is that they go straight on to our complement and then they go to the

college, and they're still on our complement and when it comes to ex gratia, it's based on our complement. So, when we're trying to get ex gratia for staff, what's actually happening, they say, 'Well we can't get ex gratia, because we're on complement.' But, they're not here; they're there. They should be on the college numbers until such times as they're actually passed and they're back and they're on the tools. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts. Any other speakers on the motion? William Reid, responding for the SNC.

WILLIAM REID – FINANCE OFFICER: Chair, Conference, we ask you to support this motion. Colleagues, not much more I can add to the supporting evidence already given from my colleagues from Edinburgh and Shotts. Shotts in particular, that's the issue I was picking up and the fact is, it's ex gratia; the possibility of ex gratia. Now, I'm not saying ex gratia's the silver bullet or the solution to all evils and stuff like that. But they're making it worse for no other than the fact that these individuals, the new recruits, are on our numbers and they're away for five, six weeks at a time. So, I'm asking you if you could support this motion, Conference. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, William. Edinburgh, right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion's carried.

Motion 29, Low Moss.

DOUGIE MUIR – BRANCH CHAIR, LOW MOSS: Chair, SNC, Conference, motion 29 reads, the training variable is allocated for every member of staff employed rather than being based solely on the staffing complement. I'll try and explain that. Conference, the current template for training variable is no longer fit for purpose. It doesn't create enough training variable for establishments, because it is based on complement, but the complement doesn't reflect that amount of staff actually employed in the establishments. Probably every establishment now has a number of part-time

staff sharing the same line, but even although those staff are on reduced hours, their training requirement doesn't reduce. Two part-time staff sharing the same line, working 18.5 hours, each of them still require the same training as one full-time member of staff. This isn't factored into the complement calculator and it's just assumed that one person occupies one line and allocates variable accordingly. Flexible part-time working will continue to become more common and we will soon struggle to meet the training needs of our members by staying on the current system. Conference, please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Low Moss. Do we have a seconder for this motion? Shotts. Wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Willie Carle on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: Conference, the variable used for core training as it stands isn't a true account of the training needed. When considering our changing workforce and part-time staff, etc. The variable as it stands is outdated and in need of change, to ensure that we have the correct staffing levels to facilitate training for every member. Passing this motion will ensure our members are supported and properly resourced. We are therefore asking you to support this motion, which would resolve the issue and give a true reflection of the training variable needed for an establishment. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Willie. Low Moss, reply? Conference, all those in favour of this motion? Motion is carried. Thank you.

Motion 30, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: The Conference mandate the SNC that any future negotiations on savings, their savings do not come from operational uniformed staff. Like it says, Conference, if they do want to make savings, let's start at the top. There's far too many managers at headquarters and not enough white

shirts on our landings. So, let's support this motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Edinburgh. Do we have a seconder for this motion? No seconder. The motion falls.

Motion 31, Grampian. Conference, do we have a seconder? No seconder. Motion falls.

Motion 32, Barlinnie.

BARLINNIE: Permission to withdraw.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Can we get Conference's permission to withdraw that motion? OK, motion withdrawn.

Motion 33, Shotts.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference, motion 33 reads, that Conference condemns those HRBPs who as advice givers input secret, negative and unsupportive submissions when staff are claiming for assaults, injuries or diseases at work. That this practice stops with immediate effect, and they stop basing these submissions on their opinion, but instead base it on an assessment of supporting documentation for that particular application only. Colleagues, we caught them hook, line and sinker. Abhorrent, despicable behaviour, found out by the Shotts local branch. We couldn't believe we had a process that was open and honest, all the way up to the point of the HRBP's input on whether or not they support Section 11 applications. Opinions, not evidence, were used at this point, and some of these self-appointed naysayers did a good job of character assassination. Moreover, didn't tell the member of staff that they'd put in a report that wasn't supporting them. Some of this inputted dribble were paragraphs long from HR. You should've seen their faces when I put an email out to my members that had been assaulted at work or who had had accidents or diseases at work, rejected. To ask the HRBP if she supported the applications or not, and why not and could they get a copy of the secret submissions. Her face was a picture as she ran to the governor,

complaining about me. My understanding of the process is, they take the evidence, the facts and the witness inputs, then comment on that only. The response of, 'Well, they don't really take my input into the final decisions anyway,' has left me flabbergasted. If that is the case, why input anything at all? If you can't find something nice to say, don't say it. It's just proved to me how HR treat staff on opinions. One task of HR is to actually support staff. I know, I know, it's actually written down, they're meant to be there to support us. It's true, look it up, it's in their policy. I hope when you go back to your establishments and you do not find any secretive negative input into a member of staff who's awaiting an outcome on a Section 11; 17.7 weeks, colleagues, for a Section 11 average, have been rejected with some of the most absurd rationales I have seen recently. And if this is not a widespread conspiracy from some secret unknown instruction to make Section 11s more difficult for the applications to be approved, it's beyond me. What I've actually got here, colleagues, is the email trails when I actually found out this was happening, and the HR. And I'll just read one of these; this was a HR consortium sitting down with some senior managers, coming up with ideas. And here's just one of them; 'Frequent short-term absence due to reasons covered by the Equalities Act 2010 cannot be managed under the current policy. If someone cannot provide effective service due to short-term absence, where they're covered by the Equality Act, then then should be able to be managed under the capability process, no matter what.' That came from Greenock, Shotts and Dumfries. So, that's what they're doing in the background, colleagues, and this is what they're doing to our members. If they've got any input, the input should be evidence-based, not an opinion. Please support.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you, Shotts. Can we have a seconder for this motion? Glenochil. Do you wish to speak?

DAVIE BEATON – BRANCH SECRETARY, GLENOCHIL: Chair, colleagues, I've spoken to John about this

previously, in fact last week, on the phone. We have instances exactly the same as what John's saying, where we have HR writing these unsupportive Section 11s without telling the members that they've done this. We have a member of staff, for example, who put a Section 11 in; submitted it, didn't get a response. Then he asked about it and was told it was been closed because you haven't got the GP's report. So, he went and got the GP's report and it was reopened. Then it was put in as an unsupportive application, and he wasn't told this. I found this out, got the report and then found out another one. So, this is something that's been new to us just recently, that we are seeing these unsupportive applications going through without informing the employee or informing the member, to say, 'These are the reasons.' There's no rationale behind it, there's no evidence, and that is the issue. Like John said, it's something that we need to be aware of really; it's very important for our members, who think everything's going through as it should go through and then they get the message back from the application saying, 'You're not getting your Section 11.' And then they find out the rest of the evidence for that. So, please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Any other speakers? Mark Meikle replying on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Chair, Conference, speaking in favour of this motion and ... just a bit of background on it; work has already begun on the issues around this. I personally have taken this to Leigh Curry, as it's part of a new wellbeing policy that's getting designed, and I've had a chat with him and I've asked that he speak to his HRBPs, because some of them are better than others at writing their submissions. Some do make it a small paragraph that is factual and goes on the evidence. Some of the branches you've heard from, I'm aware, are not and some of the other branches that I represent aren't, either. I asked Leigh to raise this issue with his HR team at a meeting. He says he's done this, and he says that he's advised the HRBPs how the submissions must be, and they

must be based on fact and take into account of all information and all supporting documentation. This is now to be included in the new wellbeing policy, which encapsulates all matters of wellbeing. The policy hasn't yet been agreed with us, the SNC, as we're still negotiating on the wording, particularly around the submissions for Section 11s, and it is part of the policy. Members should all be reminded by yourselves that they can ask to see the report in its entirety. What we are doing with this policy is to make that a matter of course that they're offered to them; however, whether that's achieved or not's yet to be seen. They can, of course, ask to see them before it's sent. I actually raised this issue at National Conference some years ago, that there should be no submission at all, because we can't achieve that in Scotland, as it's based in Westminster, the policy. It's not yet achieved, but I believe it still is our policy, Britain-wide, that the need to submit any sort of comment by HR is not necessary. So, Shotts have asked for in particular that we condemn those HRBPs that are giving the knowledge. So, in that case, please support the motion, condemning those that put in these long-winded and not-true submissions.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Mark. Shotts, reply?

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: No, thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference, all those in favour of the motion? Motion is carried.

Motion 34, Grampian. Do I have seconder for this motion? No seconder. Motion falls.

Motion 35, Barlinnie.

AUSTIN O'CONNER – BRANCH SECRETARY, BARLINNIE: Conference, Chair, motion 35 reads that the SNC update Conference on the current situation regarding the employer pursuing the use of body cameras for front line officers. We've found that we're being asked by members where we are with

this, regarding the introduction. Some of them are asking when they're being introduced, because they're receptive to them, where others are looking for information because they're not, and they're not sure that the positive will outweigh the negatives. They're looking back on when ... we were told how good the introduction of cameras were going to be for us in Barlinnie, and we're not sure how well that's worked out. Colleagues, please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Barlinnie. Conference, as this is just an update, there'll be no seconder required, and John Devine is speaking on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Chair, Conference, SNC are happy to update you. It'll be quite brief though, and it's the current situation regarding introducing these body cameras. Introducing body cameras has been on the employer's agenda for some time now, as I'm sure some of you will be aware. It also formed part of a previous recommendation from a C&R review. We have been informed that operation risk management are currently involved in some scoping work that will look at the cost of the equipment with a view to running a pilot scheme. If funding is made available, and I think that'll be a big *if*, under the current climate; maybe the Chief Executive, when she gives her statement to Conference, she'll maybe talk on where money is getting spent and where it's not getting spent. But if funding is made available, we have been informed that we'll be consulted on two relevant documents and this would be for a pilot scheme. The first document would be a policy document for the use of the equipment; we would need to look at that. We would also need to look at an equality and human right impact assessment. At present, what we can gather is that the employer's justification to introduce such equipment, it appears to be objective and is influenced by a number of stated aims. One of the aims is to enhance the safety, security and good order in our establishments. Another aim would be to support the safety, wellbeing and welfare of prisoners, staff and visitors. Also, an aim would

be for it to act as a deterrent against committing or being involved in criminal activity or alleged breaches of prison rules. Another stated aim would be to promote transparency; maybe HRBPs, some of them might need them! Trust and confidence between staff, prisoners and visitors, and also to de-escalate conflict or confrontation. So, the stated aims are there, and the stated aims are also picked up from other jurisdictions that currently use body cameras, and we need to remember that. They're worn across a wide variety of criminal justice jurisdictions, and they have been for a number of years. We've had some positive feedback from some of our colleagues down south, with the use of body cameras. Kilmarnock, as well; HMP Kilmarnock, which is soon to come back to the public, they also have body cameras. So, these are just some of the things that we need to bear in mind, when the employer approaches us. According to our employer, the evidence would suggest that the use of such equipment has been found to have a significant positive effect in the de-escalation of potentially confrontational situations. And it has proved helpful when securing convictions against perpetrators of criminal acts and assaults on staff. So, these are all the things that we would need to take into consideration, once we go and speak to the employer, if they want to go forward and introduce body cameras. We understand that this update is brief and to the point. And we also understand that some of our members; the Barlinnie delegate mentioned about some of the members may not be that satisfied with the employer planning to introduce this piece of work equipment. Just a point to note on that issue; for any trade union to object to any piece of work equipment being introduced, they would need legitimate reasons for disputing its introduction. These reasons would also have to outweigh the objective justification for its introduction, so that's just something that we would need to bear in mind, and our members would need to bear in mind, should be decide that we didn't want body cameras brought into the SPS. Some of the concerns that I've heard personally, may be in the way that the equipment and the footage, how it's accessed and how it's used and how

the policy is applied. It's like everything else, people start to move away from what they should be doing, with accessing footage. This would not be a reason to stop its introduction. What we *can* aim to do, is to ensure that there is sufficient information, instruction and training, which will go some way in avoiding any misapplication of any such equipment and how footage is accessed and used. The SNC will be happy to keep you up to date, as things progress in this matter.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, John. Motion 36, Low Moss.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Conference, SNC, motion 36 reads, this Conference mandate the SNC to engage with the SPS and seek a review of the Incident Reporting Policy to allow for a more flexible approach to timescales for completion. Conference, this is in relation to Section 8.3 of the Incident Reporting Policy, where it states that a member of staff is required to complete the incident report, prior to the end of their shift, unless in exceptional circumstances. I can understand the logic as to why this was included, in that the incident is still fresh in their mind and the fact that the member of staff may have a rest day the following day, etc. However, in some ways, this inflexibility doesn't do our members any favours at all. For one, not all incidents have the same level of seriousness. A common low-level one is two prisoners starting a fight, just before evening lock-up. At that time of night, staff will rarely get the time to complete their incident report, before going off shift, so often end up staying back after their finishing time, to complete it. You can also be guaranteed that an incident report done at 9.35 on a Friday night, in a staff member's own time, just won't have the same quality of content, as one completed the following morning in the company's time. We believe that a common-sense approach should be applied, that gives the line manager the authority to build some level of flexibility into the process, depending on the situation and severity, of course, as to whether an incident

report should be submitted before the end of shift. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Low Moss. Do we have a seconder for that motion? Glenochil. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks, Conference, more than happy to support the motion. Malky's covered perfectly there, the circumstances in which you'd identify the need for that. We're involved in a particular review at the moment, where the circumstances and events that he's talking about, and examples of that, will be taken forward by us in that review. It's perfectly clear that some of the circumstances that staff are in, in those situations are not the best frame of mind and even remotely close to being able to properly capture what's being required of them at that time. And we need to have that reviewed and we'll pick that up through the review.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Low Moss, a reply? All those in favour of the motion? The motion's carried.

Motion 37, Shotts.

ALAN STUART – BRANCH SECRETARY, SHOTTS: Chair, SNC, Conference, the motion reads that Conference supports a call for mandatory random drug testing within the SPS. Conference, drug testing is still far from commonplace in UK workplaces. However, we live in a culture where 31% of the population have taken illegal drugs, with 21% admitting to continuing to take them, either regularly or on occasion. The Health and Safety Executive view is that there is no need for widespread workplace drug testing, but for how long? Ideas are changing around the subject of workplace drug testing, in terms of both when and how testing is carried out. There's been a growing interest in pre-employment testing, for example, which marks a concerted effort to discourage the recruitment of staff with a history of substance misuse; a

particular concern in high-risk workplaces, like prisons. This may be the way to go. Of course, drug and alcohol testing doesn't solely exist before employment; it can also be used for existing employees. In this case, it could be seen as a protocol to promote health and safety, and wellbeing too. If you can identify someone with a history of misuse, it should lead to them entering an assistance programme where they receive appropriate help to turn their lives around for the better. Maybe now is a time to protect the vast majority of our membership from the potential threat to security and safety that substance misuse represents. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you, Shotts. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Perth. Do you wish to speak?

ANDY BROWN – BRANCH CHAIR, PERTH: Conference, we were going to raise a motion ourselves, at Perth, because we were asked to, by our members. Hypothetically, this next bit; some of the members that had a night out involved with other staff and some of our staff witnessed other members of staff using recreational substances and it caused a great divide in the staff group, because the essence of it is, if these people are buying and using these recreational drugs, where are they getting them from? It's as simple as that. And that's putting our staff at risk, so to minimise the risk to our staff group, make it safer for everybody, staff not being be compromised or victimised by the dealers that are obviously supplying them the stuff. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you, Perth. College.

PHIL THOMAS – COMMITTEE MEMBER, SPS COLLEGE / HQ: Chair, SNC, Conference, asking you to reject the motion. I understand that we want to rid people from an organisation if they are taking drugs, but how's it going to be done? Are you going to identify specific drugs? You could put our members at the back foot, by saying going to capability because they've identified that they've taken opiates or steroids as part of their

medication. It'll open it up; it just needs something a bit more caveat and more specific, for me, so I'm asking you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you. Any other speakers? Jim McCabe, on behalf of the SNC.

JIM MCCABE – SNC: Chair, Conference, the SNC also ask you to reject this motion. If management came to us tomorrow and said to us, 'We're going to drug test all your members.' You'd be like... that worried; it's not happening. We could argue that, if you want to test them, why don't you use your policies better? Why don't you use your alcohol and substance misuse policy? Why don't you do interrogatory interviews? And who's going to do the testing? Is it staff on staff? Is it outside agencies? What's going to happen to the person that gets tested? Which is gross misconduct; sacked, no support for a person that might need help. We've all seen orderly rooms turned over on an MDT test when they go in to get re-tested, and then the guy's not guilty and he saw what was out of order and ... singing and dancing; get away with that, don't they? But for the member of staff, it's totally different. If you're a member of staff and you've been named that you've been drug tested and you've failed it, that's with you for the rest of your career. You ain't getting over that ... mud sticks, people. I'd ask you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Jim. Shotts, right to reply?

ALAN STUART – BRANCH SECRETARY, SHOTTS: No thanks.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference, all those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion's lost. Conference; approval for card vote? *Support* a card vote, sorry. Yeah, we got it. OK, we'll have the scrutineers and tellers round, to hand it out, and we'll get the result back in to you <pause>. Conference, sorry, I did say I'd make mistakes through this; we *do* have the branches' to support ... enough branches for the card vote, but do we now have Conference support

for the card vote? All those in favour of the card vote? OK.

<Card Vote>

OK, Conference, we'll move on, and we'll get the results of the card vote, when we have it.

Motion 38, Barlinnie.

AUSTIN O'CONNOR – BRANCH SECRETARY, BARLINNIE: Conference, Chair, motion 38 reads, Conference supports the SNC position and action on providing regular updates to the membership. This is another motion that speaks for itself. We feel that, especially during COVID, the updates were helpful with the constant changes that were happening daily. We withdrew motion 32 for the very reason that a regular update answered the question of that motion. The updates are valuable and should be supported and continue to be provided. We feel that the regular updates from the SNC are necessary, going forward. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Barlinnie. Do we have a seconder for that motion? Cornton Vale. Cornton Vale, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Shotts.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH SECRETARY, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference, supporting the motion. As you know, we've been asking ... all the new folk that's arrived here, we've been asking for years about this and getting a good communication system set up. It's still not perfect, but it's a lot, lot better than what it was. What I will say is, at the lock-up meetings that we've had recently, when the SNC have actually turned up, etc., they've been good lock-up meetings. Staff have got points across, they liked the style that's coming back to them, and it's working really well, so please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts. Any other speakers on the motion? The SNC don't have a speaker on this motion,

either. So, all those in favour of this motion? Motion is carried.

Conference, we're going to have a wee break, now. There'll be tea and coffee available in four minutes, in the Regency room, and if I could ask everyone to be back and seated for half-past-three, thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY - SNC CHAIR: Conference, before we move on to motion 39, we've got the outcome of the card vote, which was motion 37. Votes for, was 1,762; votes against, was 1,628. Therefore, the motion is carried.

Motion 39, Edinburgh.

<Break in recording>

Do we have a seconder for the motion? No seconder. Motion falls.

Motion 40, Low Moss.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: SNC, Conference, motion 40 reads, this Conference mandates the SNC to seek that the SPS do not misuse the Talk to Me policy, solely as a means of observation for admission prisoners who are not seen that day by NHS nursing staff, and that the SPS develop a suitable policy or observation system catering for prisoners in these circumstances. If you work in admissions, you'll recognise this issue; it's past finishing time and you're still waiting on half a dozen admissions from court, that aren't going to turn up for at least another 20 minutes. And all the nursing staff, quite rightly, have left. When the prisoners finally do turn up, despite being interviewed by prison staff as to their intention to commit suicide, and answering, 'No,' they're still placed on Talk to Me, and in most cases on 15-minute observations, simply because they've not had the opportunity to see a nurse that evening. Not only is this a misuse of a policy strictly designed for people who *are* at risk of taking their own lives; it's an intensive burdening process for our members, because of the level of paper work and resources,

particularly as a case conference requiring three people and the prisoner, is needed to remove it. The main issue is, the SPS don't have a recognised policy or observation procedure to deal with admission prisoners not seen by a nurse, but there's no reason why a more appropriate recognised practice couldn't be developed, that doesn't involve the resources of Talk to Me. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Low Moss. Do we have a seconder? Glenochil. Do you wish to speak?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, Conference, supporting the motion, and we're not a receiving establishment from courts etc., but we are a receiving establishment from other establishments that send prisoners over, and we have the same problem. They don't get seen by a nurse, the reception officer interviews them and then for some reason, they get miraculously put on Talk to Me, because that's not good enough, it's a misuse of the policy. We actually went to our senior management and explained that what it says is, 'If the prisoner exhibits no signs of suicidal thoughts or tendencies, the officer can interview them and place them into a hall.' They're not willing to do that, because they say that runs a risk, and it's up to the management to fix that and resolve that. I'd go say ... as far as, we've actually got a situation at our jail, which is probably not unique to our jail, where they try and put them on medical obs for whatever reason. There is no such thing in the SPS. The only observations that we do as officers, is under suicide watch or under Morse, and even then, they get checked out by a nurse, and then they're placed on various documentation to do that. We should not be doing this as a matter of course; it shouldn't be happening at receiving establishments from courts, and it certainly shouldn't be happening at any other establishment, so please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Anyone else? Mark Meikle on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Conference, Chair, speaking in favour of this motion and for the very points that Malky's pointed out, and Billy. It appears that this is currently happening at several establishments, and to my knowledge, it's at all receiving establishments. Since the COVID working patterns were ended, many establishments no longer have nursing cover available until 9 pm, with various finishing times for nursing staff. If admissions come in and there is no nurses, reception officers are being instructed by their managers to place them on Talk to Me. This obviously is not the appropriate observation system. I get why it's being done; it's being done to ensure the admission is observed throughout the night, and it does entail regularly awakening them, to get a response. This is obviously not the appropriate observation system. An appropriate system should be negotiated and, if supported, the SNC will seek to do this or ideally, it should be put back to the NHS to supply appropriate cover, because like everything else, this is falling to the D-banded staff, to observe them. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Mark. Low Moss, right to reply? Conference, all those in favour of the motion? Motion's carried.

Motion 41, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, SNC, Conference, we have a vote of confidence in relation to the failure of the SPS management to recruit staff and fill posts in establishments. Please support this motion. This is a massive problem; we're so short-staffed and it's taken headquarters so slow to recruit staff. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference, do we have a seconder to that motion? No seconder. The motion falls.

Motion 42 is a composite; it'll be SNC moving it and Edinburgh seconding it and we've got Mark Meikle up for a debate.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Chair, Conference, to move the debate; Conference, since 1995 when SNC was introduced, the SPS, as a savings exercise, we've been operating a two-tier system of prison officers. Very soon after this, it became this union's policy to negotiate a return to a one-tier system. When POA was proposed, this aim was offered as part of the deal and was overwhelmingly rejected. Whereas the main reason reported for rejection was unpalatable shift patterns, feedback was received suggesting that a one-tier officer, was perhaps not as popular as we believed. It became apparent that some operations staff said to us that they had no desire to work in residential, and if they did, they would apply to do so. And many residential officers says they did not want to carry out some of the operations duties, mainly night shifts and back shift weekends. We currently negotiate to make the transition between C to D as seamless as possible. We are aiming to make this a much more report-based, on PPMS etc. Some of us older members will remember fitted and not-fitted and soon-to-be-fitted system, which seemed to work at the time. Currently, if you pass a board, you remain on the list and only required to do the interview stage for subsequent positions. So, if you pass the test or any matters that you have to do, you only have to do the interview, going forward. We're aware that direct entry to D Band is not popular amongst ops staff, however the fact that 75% of residential staff come from operations group, this gives us some reassurance that things are working. The other consideration, of course, is cost implications of this and how this would affect people that were already at the top of their tier, should this be achieved. The debate should not be seen as a slight on operations staff, in any way. This union will fight for operations staff, no matter what grade or system we have in place. The motion calls for a debate, and there is no subsequent motion after, to endorse this. I believe it is important that the SNC get a clear understanding of what their members wish to achieve, and many staff have never known or worked in a one-tier system. It would be helpful if branches have this debate amongst both bands, to get a clear steer on what

the membership want. This may result in future motions negotiating ... relating to the issue. Please join in the debate.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Mark. Edinburgh? Anyone else wishing to join the debate? Shotts.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference, I actually, after POP didn't know where we stood on a one-tier prison officer, because we had that many mixed messages, and what had actually came to light, which was said by Mark earlier on, was the amount of C Band officers who didn't want to walk down the halls, was a lot larger than what I expected, and vice versa; a lot of the D band staff were saying, 'There's no danger I'm going to work up in the visit room or do a night shift, ever again.' So, we had quite a large disparity on that, but it left me, as the local branch rep, not knowing where we stood as a union on this matter, after what happened at POP, because the overwhelming rejection sounded to me like a mandate not to have a one-tier prison officer, the way it was going at that point in time. And what's coming loud and clear, now, from the young staff that are joining just now, they're quite happy to run visits, gate, vestibule and not go down the hall and deal with some of these hardened criminals, who just want to batter your face in at every opportunity, and the risks and the stresses involved; they're quite happy sitting up at that end. And it's hard to say, but our older staff, who are down there, putting their selves through this day in and day out, have got so used to it, that trying to offer them a support mechanism out, is like questioning their ability, for some strange reason, where they're suffering from the stresses and the assaults and everything that's going on with dealing with some people who don't want to be dealt with. And it's left us quite clear now that, as it stands as a future for this organisation, for the POA, we need a clear mandate so we can best represent our membership. But at this moment in time, it looks like to me, that a one-tier prison officer is no longer viable, and I think we need to find that out as branches, from our membership, so that we can relay that back

to the SNC, because this is important for negotiations. Please join the debate, colleagues.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts. Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates, we actually had this debate at one our lock-up meetings or should we say, we've asked for a vote, and it was split. It was actually *for* a one-tier officer, by a small margin; 10, 15 votes. But what actually the debate that came out, was more about how it's actioned, because what we're finding ourselves with dealing with capabilities and people that are reaching the 60-plus mark is, they're more concerned about what they do when they're unable to function as a D Band and where can they go for, not a quieter life, but maybe a different pace of things and all the rest of it. It used to be that you could get pay protection. That is, seemingly, not a thing, anymore, because we asked for a member of staff who was struggling as a D Band, to go on ... and he volunteered to go on to the night shift, and he was told that after three months, he would have to reduce to a operations officer grade and that would then impact on his pension. So, quite rightly so, he said, 'No, I'm not doing that.' So, it's maybe not the debate about whether it's a one-tier officer, and I'd just like to point out having been to three POP debates, we never were going to go to a one-tier officer, because POP was then reintroducing a front-of-house officer that was going to be equivalent to a B Band. So, it was never going to be a one-tier system, we were going to farm that out to somebody else to cover it, because the SPS were ditching that aspect of it. And that came out at three debates that I went to and highlighted to the SNC at the time. We need to look at how we are dealing with our staff across the board, whether we're accepting the fact that you can come in as an operations officer, you progress up through the ranks into the D and then potentially, at the other end of it, you migrate back the way. But it shouldn't come at the expense of your wages. So, join in the debate and let's hope we can fix this.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank, Glenochil. Anyone else wishing to join the debate?

Motion 43, Barlinnie.

AUSTIN O'CONNER – BRANCH SECRETARY, BARLINNIE: Conference, Chair, motion 43 reads, Conference mandate the SNC to seek an explanation from the employer regarding the ongoing problems of late payments of ex gratia to individuals. We've been inundated with calls from staff who are doing ex gratia in good faith; they cannot project when they will receive payment, there appears to be no rhyme or reason about it. We're looking for the SNC just to get an explanation for them. Colleagues, support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Barlinnie. Conference, do we have a seconder for this motion? Glenochil. Do you wish to speak?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates, to highlight one of the cases that we had recently at Glenochil; a team of staff who did ex gratia duties, seven months, it took them to get their pay. By the time they got paid, it was after the change to the tax rules, so what actually happened was, they ended up paying more in tax than they should have when they actually did the duties. And it all came about because pay section said, 'The wrong paperwork was filled out,' 'The wrong bits were applied;' it would take another three months to sort this out. Now I get the fact that pay section said they were under pressure, but if a member of staff does ex gratia or covers any duty in a month, it should be paid either that month or the following month at the latest, and something needs to be done to put a safeguard in, that says it doesn't drag on for months afterwards and requires the actual member of staff themselves to put grievances in, to actually raise the issue, because somebody somewhere decides, 'I'm not doing that, right now,' because that's in their *too-hard books*. Please support this motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Any other speakers? Willie Carle on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: Conference, we're asking you to support this motion. We're all aware of the problems we have had with the process and of getting ex gratia on time. The process is not fit for purpose. We've had issues from human error, inputting data or missing the timescales, to computer error. Which is not acceptable when members are relying prompt, correct payments for the work they have done. As such, we have been in discussions with HR digital services, to resolve this issue and put in place a simpler, less bureaucratic process. We ask you to support this motion, as we will be monitoring any changes and seeking explanations regarding any problems with ex gratia payments from now on. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank, Willie. Barlinnie, reply? All those in favour of the motion? Motion's carried.

Conference, just going to take a small break again from the agenda, and we're going to invite the final speaker of the day, our Deputy General Secretary, Joe Simpson, to address Conference.

JOE SIMPSON – DEPUTY GENERAL SECRETARY: Chair, SNC, Conference, thanks very much for allowing me to speak, and address you all. It's good to see you all, it really is, and it's good to see you back where we do the business of our members; and that is your Conference, our Conference. As you can see ... I nearly swore there! As you can see from down in Westminster and what we call *musical chairs*, which it currently is; the cabinet and the government that's an absolute shambles at the minute, the way that they are going about. And we've just got Dominic Raab back, or as I call him, 'The Chief Prison Officer,' because he seems to think that he knows what's best for our workplace. And the man comes out with some stupid things, and I can say that, because I'm never ever going to meet him, for the simple ... that's down to our Chair, Mark Fairhurst and

the General Secretary, Steve Gillan. That's why it's always good to be a Deputy General Secretary. Conference, we're going to talk about pay. And I know that you are in dispute with your pay, and the one thing that should come from this Conference, should come from the whole of our trade union is; we make no apology to anybody when we come and ask for a decent and fair pay rise, so that our members' living is very good. We don't take pay cuts. And ... which is down to you as well; 'If you don't give us what we're ask for, then we will take whatever action it needs, in order for you to sit and listen.' And as your Deputy General Secretary, I'll echo what the National Chairman said; as soon as you announce the day, all FTOs will be in Scotland, to assist you, to stand on your picket lines, to do any press and to assist the SNC. That is only right. I'm going to come on to a subject that I don't think there's been any real debate or problem within any of our prisons, and that's pensions. Because all we seem to get now is, 'You never told me that there was compensation on the table, back in 2017' Really? Wasn't it you, the members who came along and said to the union, 'What you going to do about it?' Well, what we done about it was, we give the member the facility to go to an employment tribunal, to make that complaint. That's what it was about; if you wanted compensation, I'm sure the Tory government would've turned around and said, 'We'll give you compensation, because we've taken your pension away; there's five hundred quid, now disappear.' It wasn't about that. It was about the fact that they came along and took something off you, which was yours. And we want it back. So, we've been successful in getting seven years of it back for a lot of members, especially those members in Classic. But not only that, those of our members who were ill health retired between 2015 and 2022, are now going to get the pension that they should've received, with the enhancements. But not only with the enhancements, they're also going to get the compensation, they are also going to get 8% on top of that pension. And, if they wish to take a further enhanced lump sum, because it's an extra payment, you have to pay tax on it. We have got an agreement

from government that *they* will pay the tax on that. Now we come to the compensation. Some people seem to think that we negotiated that; we didn't. What happens is, it goes in front of ... or we put our claim in, and we say, 'We've got injury to feelings.' How does that come about? And there's a set tier, it's either upper or lower. The lower tier is, 'You took me pension off me and yeah, I was OK, but I was a little bit sad about it.' You'll get the low tier. If you then turn around and said, 'No, this has cost me *this*,' 'I've lost my house,' *this* has happened, *that's* happened, then the upper tier comes into it; injury to feelings. And then now, we've got the FBU, they're getting their compensation payment, and it's 3,700 I think, off the top of my head, the low payment; and the upper payment's seven-and-a-half grand. That's simply because our pension is a lot better than theirs. And when we sat down and looked at it, if you were a firefighter and you retired at 50, 55, you'd get somewhere in the region, if you were an average pension holder, roughly round about a gratuity of 130,000. If you then turned around and said, 'No, I'll work on,' like they're going to do in the new pension scheme, that 130,000 by the time they came to retire, was down to 55. Ours hasn't changed; there's has. That's why they got the increased money, if you want to say that. And then, as I've come up to Scotland and I was walking round, I've been asking members about partnership and coming back into the principle civil service pension scheme, to get them seven years. So, then I had to go back to cabinet office to say, 'Those who've transferred over into partnership and now they want to come back into the ... pension scheme, what do they have to do?' Well, at first, they weren't even going to entertain them coming back in, but we've put enough pressure on them to say, 'No, that's not fair,' because they only changed the pension scheme because of you going to 67, 68. So, now, what they've agreed to is, they will look at each case individually and they will make an assessment as to, *if* they can come back into it. We'll put more pressure on them, but it is going to cost them money, especially if you left in 2015 and you want to rejoin in 2022. Then it's going to cost you all your back subscriptions, but not

only that, the employer has to pay as well, so what they are looking at is that nice pot that you've grown under partnership, they are looking at using that from the employer's contributions to pay their contributions. So, that pot will go down very, very quickly. That's their thinking on it; they haven't firmed it up yet, and that's only because, on behalf of members, I've took that forward. I'll update the membership on that, but we will try and fight to keep that going. The third thing, Chair, that I want to speak about is the union. Who is the union? Every time I go into branches, it doesn't matter where, they always come up and say, 'What's the union doing about *this*?' And I look straight back at them and say, 'I don't know; what *you* doing about it?' Our members have got to understand that *they* are the trade union. Not me, not the NEC, not the SNC, not you; the members. Because, what I have found out about pensions, believe you me, I wish I'd never started on it, they always come up and say, 'What's the union going to do about it?' Well, what've *you* done about it? Have you wrote your MP? Have you done *this*? Have you done *that*? Have you wrote your employer? Have you told your governor that you're not happy about your pension? 'Well, no.' Have you told your governor, that you're not happy with your pay? And I've just realised, the ex-gratia payment here is overtime. So, hang on a minute, if I'm working overtime for you, I expect to see it in my pay packet; if it's not in my pay packet, I'm not going to do it. Not, come up and say to the SNC or to the branch official, 'What are you doing about it?' Well, quite simply, I don't work it, so I'll do nothing about it, because it doesn't affect me. But we've got to go together, we cannot do it singly and we cannot do it where we say, 'We're going in that direction,' and then change it later. We should be paving the way for what we want, and what we should be doing, so we should have a pay policy. What is our pay policy? What is your pay policy here? What do the members want? And quite rightly, when you were talking about the one-tier prison officer, we're starting to get that little bit of, 'Well, do we really want it?' 'Don't we want it?' What do you want? Because it changes every time. And the reason

I say that is quite simply, we have changed the retirement age that we are asking for, for prison officers ... sorry, POA members, three times now. Thankfully, we've got the right one and that's the pension age, of 60. If you want to go beyond that, you go beyond that, but this is our parliament, members need to understand, what they want has to come via them, to you, to the SNC, to deliver. So, that's what we need to do and we need to bring them together and we need to get them acting as one. Because if we're divided, they will come through those cracks; they will chisel into them and they will widen those cracks. So, as far as I'm concerned, Conference, it's fantastic to see you. And from me, thank you so much for your nominations; that means a lot to me, that I have your support. I wish you well for the rest of your Conference. You're rattling through your motions! I thought I was going to be speaking at 4 o'clock, and I'll get off now, because it's gone past 4. Thank you very much, Chair, thank you Conference.

<Applause>

<Break in recording>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Joe, thanks for taking the time to address Conference. And just as you touched on at the end there, the nominations you got from Scotland, it was mentioned in my opening statement ... obviously you were travelling down, but I wish you all the best for your re-election and I hope it will be as successful.

Motion 44, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, SNC, Conference, that the SNC enter into negotiations with the SPS to ensure that ex gratia payments are paid more timeously. The current monthly cut-off dates are unacceptable. Please support this motion. I'll explain a bit to you; staff are working ex gratia shifts. They're keeping the SPS running, but they have to wait to get paid. Our colleagues could actually work to, say, September 28th, but they will not get paid for that, until November. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Edinburgh. Do we have a seconder for that motion? Glenochil. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? John Devine, on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Chair, Conference, the SNC would like to support Edinburgh in this motion. We're fully aware of the current set of circumstances surrounding ex gratia payments, which due to delays and inaccuracies, can cause some hardship for our members. It's only right that we seek a solution that resolves the current difficulties. Whether it be late payments, no payment or inaccurate payments, it all amounts to the fact that a new process is needed. As previously stated in another motion, our employer is doing work to introduce a new system, which forms part of the ongoing digital transformation work, and the SNC will continue to engage in this work, to seek a reliable solution to the current problems.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, John. Edinburgh, right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? That motion's carried.

Motion 45, Barlinnie.

AUSTIN O'CONNOR – BRANCH SECRETARY, BARLINNIE: Conference, Chair, it seems as if we're harping on again, about the ex gratia. Motion 45 reads, Conference mandates the SNC to approach the employer, to negotiate a new system to pay ex gratia separate from their salary, to ensure prompt payment within a reasonable time frame. Colleagues, this motion came from the floor; I'm not sure of the logistics of creating a new process. We have to ask the question, 'Would it be feasible?' I know they've touched on a new system ... earlier motions. I'd ask you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Barlinnie. Conference, do we have a seconder for this motion? Low Moss. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? John Devine, on behalf of SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Conference, Chair, on this occasion, we're asking you to reject this motion. We're already in negotiations. As stated in the previous motions, we are aware of the difficulties within the current system. With any new system, we should accept that there may be occasions that the payment may be paid with salary, which would make it the quickest way for that particular occasion, so we would ask Conference to reject this motion and allow for the opportunity for a new system to be introduced. This should ... internally alleviate the concerns of those members who are not content with the current process.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, John. Barlinnie, right to reply. All those in favour? All those against? The motion's lost.

Conference, as has been mentioned by a few people today already, we're rattling through the agenda. So, we're going to have an early finish tonight. Just a couple of things to mention before we go away. In your packs, it says breakfast is 7 am; it's actually 7.30. So, if you could note that change. Start tomorrow is going to be 9.45, rather than 9.15, and as previously mentioned after the break, those of you that got the raffle slip put down, if you can complete it and put it in the basket at the back, to allow Group Life to prepare for the raffle tomorrow. Delegates, if you could stay behind for 10, 15 minutes at the end of this, and the rest of the Conference are free to go; just a reminder that there's ... the free bar tonight is 6 o'clock to 6.45, and it's in *Not the cocktail bar*. That's what it's called; I'm not trying to trick people not to go! It's called *Not the cocktail bar*. And that's from 6 o'clock to quarter-to-seven. And then the informal meal is quarter-to-seven onwards, in this ballroom. So, thank you.

TAYAV004 is missing

TAYAV005 starts:

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just before we start with the agenda, obviously there **was a...**

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: **...to get** over the fact is we have got

a lot of new females at HMP Shotts and we think we're sitting with a 60/40 ish split at this moment in time and a lot of these young females are getting pregnant and we have got absolutely no cover for them whatsoever and it's having a major impact. It's having a major impact on the security of the establishment where we've got females in the halls, females running the health safety, the education who are coming into the landings and there's females on the landings and we're not managing to rubdown search etc. it's causing major concerns. There seems to be a reluctance for the SPS to actually, without being sexist about the amount of females that we're getting, but we run a predominantly male environment at this moment in time and the sick on top of maternity, and now paternity, is causing real, real concerns because the variable is not there. The sick variable, I think, if memory serves me right, is seven what we've got across the organisation. We are way, way above that and it's not improving and it has not improved for the time that I've been in the job and the variable that we've been given for it is just not working to be perfectly honest with you. I think to have a debate on this is really needed at this moment in time because they're sitting at the top of the table up there for HR, for the SPS and it has to be recognised that this is causing major problems. The problems are there to see right across the estate so please join this debate, colleagues, thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Shotts. Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates. It came to light with us last year, we had seven, well, between operations and residential officers. Seven young ladies all off pregnant, no cover. That left us no cover in the halls, no cover in operations. When you look into it and you actually sit down the only goal that's actually covered is Cornton Vale and that was back when it was first decided back in the years of 1990-something. We've asked for it umpteen times, we've actually got the backing of HR BP

and actually points out we've asked for this, we're pointing this out. The variable doesn't cover it, the sick doesn't cover it – it's a gap that just won't get plugged because it's in the too hard box and it's impacting more so now. Shotts was saying there, well, we did our survey a few weeks ago; we're probably sitting at the 50/50 mark and actually we're probably swinging the other way, we're going to have actually more females working in our establishment than males. To explain that I went on a landing or into a hall on a landing, there was three males and the rest of the staff were females on a shift. Now, I get that, that can happen, that's down to the rostering, but when you go speak to the FLM, 'I can only roster what I've got, I can only roster what I'm given and I can only roster what I get for the college.' Something somewhere, the numbers don't add up and what we do need to do is get the SNC sitting round the table with our employers further up the table to say, 'You need to fix this. The variable's not enough, the sick cover's not enough.' It's a culmination of all of that. We just need to get it sorted. Thanks very much.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Glenochil. Inverness.

ROBERT LEES – BRANCH CHAIR, INVERNESS: Chair, SNC, colleagues. I just want to reiterate what my previous colleagues have said. My basis for seeing an increase is that in Inverness we are well below other establishments in respect of this variable and in recent years has demonstrated that seven is not a viable variable for us and it's been a contributing factor to us running a temporary day shift routine to keep staff safe in HMP Inverness. I support the debate, thanks very much.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Inverness. Anyone else wishing to join the debate? Mark Meikle on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Morning Conference, joining the debate on behalf of the

SNC. As we all know, the dynamic of the operational staff in establishments has wholeheartedly changed with a shift in much more female employees working with us. When the current variables were calculated there was very few, if any, operational females and the variable that was calculated, where we have sick and training variables that are calculated, the only other bit way is, and it's called 'other' with a dash and then one, it's one day per member of staff per year is the variable that we're allocated for time off that you take that's not sick. It's clearly not enough for the dynamic that we now have and it has to be challenged and it is already our policy to achieve this. The sick variable is slightly more complicated, it calls for a debate on that as well. It's a wee bit more complex and that's calculated and different prisons have different amounts, however, it is something we'll still challenge. We should, and we will be, negotiating to have this increased if we can. It should be remembered, however, that this comes at a cost but it is still something that we should achieve and we are wholly aware of the issues that we have with the time that people need for paternity and maternity. Please join the debate. And I notice there's a moving motion hereafter this one but feel free to join the debate first.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Mark. Motion 47 is forwarded by Dumfries and will be seconded Low Moss.

BRIAN ALISON – PLR, DUMFRIES: Chair, Conference. Motion 47 reads: That Conference mandate the SNC to seek to negotiate a suitable variable provision to establishment complements for maternity leave that adequately reflects the needs of establishments.

It's already been said in the previous motion and in debate, but as we move towards a more gender balanced service, we are getting a lot more young female staff, they're starting in a job, they're starting families. For example, you take a small establishment like Dumfries and last year we lost well over a thousand shifts to

maternity leave. No cover. A thousand shifts down before we start and you've got no cover for that and that's onto an already depleted workforce. We need a provision to cover this. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Dumfries. Low Moss. Anyone else wish to speak on the motion? Mark Meikle, on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Conference, on behalf of the SNC, as Brian's already alluded to it's all been said in the debate, I think we're all very aware of the dynamic that we now have and how the variable's not as suitable as it should be. As we have already debated this is a moving motion in that you ask that we, the SNC, on your behalf, negotiate with the SPS to get these variables properly sorted. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Mark. Dumfries, right to reply? No. All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 48 – Barlinnie.

MICK MULHOLLAND – BRANCH CHAIR, BARLINNIE: Conference, Chair. Motion 48 reads: Conference instruct the SNC to raise the issue of Shared Parental Leave with the Scottish Prison Service and anomalies within the policy.

Interpretation and implementation of the policy's is inconsistent and confusing. An example of this, Section 6 of the Shared Parental Leave states, 'Periods of Shared Parental Leave do not have to be consecutive and the two parents can take leave at the same time, provided that the total amount of leave does not exceed 52 weeks.' In our experience that didn't happen, it just doesn't happen in the SPS. Recently at Barlinnie we had a member that received clear guidance from our HR, who in turn went to Employee Relations [10:26 Award], with clear instruction of what to do. However, by the time the member actually accessed the policy the advice had changed

with no rationale as to why. We do not believe that these changes were down to malicious or deliberate obstructions, but down to a genuine misunderstanding of the policies. We ask you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Barlinnie. Conference, do we have a seconder for the motion? Low Moss. Low Moss, wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Good morning, Conference, on behalf of the SNC. Happy to support the motion. I think slightly into what, I don't know that it is an anomaly or not but actually the way it's been designed does create an inconsistency in application of access to it, depending when you choose to access the policy itself, so we'll raise that with management and take it forward, thanks.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Phil. Barlinnie, respond? All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 49 – Low Moss.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Conference, motion 49: That this union seek to include additional variable cover for trainers in order to deliver training.

Conference, a good number of our core competency training is delivered by operational staff, yet SPS don't actually provide variable cover to allow these trainers to come offline to do this. Currently, each establishment has to eat into any existing variable they've got in order to allow operational trainers to facilitate training, and if that variable is already exhausted then the area will inevitably run short if training's cancelled. What we require is an increase in the current variable to compensate for this so please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Low Moss.

Have a seconder for that motion? Glenochil.
Wish to speak Glenochil?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates. Fully support this motion because actually, again, it came to light when we were sitting having a chat up in the board room that most of our trainers are FLMS, and you only have a certain amount of FLMS, and when you try and release them up the variables are not there to give them the training. Then what they turn round and say to you is we've got to release them to the college because they need to do national training, we'll get ex gratia to cover it. But the trainers are actually the FLMS and there's not enough of them to cover for the ex gratia to get covered, because we don't have an additional variable for people who are trained up to be trainers. Your training days, which is five, I believe, attached to each individual are for your personal training, not to deliver training. They don't have an additional variable once you become a trainer. I believe the only other job within the SPS that has additional training days is the kitchen and that's because they mandatory have to have an additional five days for training that makes sure that health and safety's followed. Fully support this debate and I'm glad it's up here. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Glenochil. Anyone else wish to speak? Karen Ewen on behalf of the SNC.

KAREN EWEN – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC. We are happy to support this motion given the increase in the training delivery and the extension of training days for CNR etc. it makes sense that the training variable is also increased so the establishments can fully deliver the training that's expected of them. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Karen. Low Moss, like to reply? All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 50 – Low Moss.

DOUGIE MUIR – BRANCH CHAIR, LOW MOSS: Chair, SNS, Conference. Motion 50 reads: This branch mandate the SNC to negotiate an increase in training variable to reflect the increase in core competency training.

Colleagues, very simple, our core competency training has increased, in particular emergency response and CNR, but the training variable remains the same, which currently leaves establishments having to use valuable sick variable or training being cancelled outright. It's only right that our members are afforded adequate cover and time to attend mandatory training. Colleagues, please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Low Moss. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Dumfries, wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? William Reid on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIAM REID – FINANCE OFFICER: Chair, Conference, responding on behalf of the SNC. Conference, we are asking you to support this motion but with a caveat. The caveat is that, Dougie, you tell him never to sing again at the karaoke, OK? <Laughs> Seriously, my colleague is raising it on the same issues, the variables, we've discussed them but see now the more [16:44 quality] role, so straightforward forward. There needs to be an understanding that when we do all this extra training we do need cover, so like I said, we ask you to support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks William. Low Moss, right to reply. All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 51- Inverness.

ROBERT LEES – BRANCH CHAIR, INVERNESS: Chair, SNC, colleagues. The motion reads: Conference mandate the SNC to seek an increase in the sick absence variable for HMP Inverness to ease the staffing crisis. This would make the establishment safer and assist

with the return to the early/backshift agreed attendance pattern.

As previously stated, we are well below other establishments in respect of this variable, especially after the effects of long COVID. It's affected a number of our staff. Seven is not a viable variable for us and really if we could get that increased we could get back to an early shift/backshift routine. Support the motion, thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Inverness. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Low Moss. Low Moss, right to speak. Anyone else wishing to speak? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks. Conference, we're happy to support the motion. I appreciate that that looks a bit of a local issue given that we're only talking about Inverness in this one. Actually the background to the sick variable that Inverness has got came from a realignment of the variable that was done many, many years ago now in the service which was based on historical data around absence levels in the service. Inverness' was lower than anybody's by some distance which is why they ended up with such a low variable, so I can understand why they're the branch that brought it. The impact on a smaller establishment, that kind of shortfall is disproportionate to the larger establishments in terms of coping with that. But, as you can see from this section in the agenda, variables is an issue right across the board so we will engage with the employer on the issue around that but I'm pretty certain that it won't just be that establishment that we're talking about, it won't just be about that single issue.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Phil. Inverness, like to reply? All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 52 – Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, Conference. Conference debate the need to return to

traditional shift patterns, early shift and backshift.

This is a problem with COVID out there, within a core day. We feel now that we were told to actually return to our shift patterns on the 27th of September. We as a gaol were still working a core day. We're now looking for volunteers to work the core day and we're arguing amongst ourselves, 'Who's doing the early shift, who's doing the backshift, why are you doing a core day?' Like what it states, we must return to a working day on early shift/backshift. Please debate.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Edinburgh. Anyone wishing to join the debate? Shotts then Grampian.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference. We are back to, with attendance patterns doing an early shift/backshift, but we've encountered some anomalies by doing so because we've sort of swapped what we did on our backshift to now doing it on a day shift, which is we've got four on the landings observing prisoners, where on the backshift it was four on the landing observing prisoners [21:23 IA]. So, our day now has reversed itself. The downside to that is actually the staff are delivering everything that they were delivering on an early shift but it's now like a day shift; we have got no nurse cover at Shotts for our backshift. The nurses are joining the job and leaving almost immediately. The way it's standing now is on our backshift we are only opening prisoners to go out for exercise, to go to the gymnasium or to go to visits or to do personal prisoner work. We are short of staff as it is and mainly we're short on the backshift, but we're restricted. So we're sort of in a position now where we've also got the prisoners open all day and, I don't know if it's a lead from headquarters, prison rules, it's quite clear: all prisoners must go to work. They're not at Shotts and the governor doesn't want them to go to work. So, you can see that there's a push here coming in of what they're looking for in a core day, so while we are back to early

shift/backshift, things are changing and things are shifting. We need to be really aware of what this might mean further down the line because these guys at the top table here are going to have to sit down, because we know what's coming. Government was quite clear in what they said yesterday, they're coming for the justice sector. That means they're going to come for us again and they're going to try and look at [23:07] efficiencies. We need to be aware, and when we're having this debate, what it might mean for establishments. Every single establishment should be back to early shift/backshift. They should be back to that and if we've not got the staffing levels to run what they expect us to run we restrict. That's what we should be doing. And that's what we're doing at Shotts just now. Further down the line, if we don't get nurse cover, through to health and safety reasons, the governors not opening up on the backshift, and we're quite happy with that and the staff are quite happy with not opening up on the backshift, but we've got to deliver some sort of business. because see if we don't we're looking at going down a line here of do we require D band officers on a backshift anymore? So, we need to be really careful and really aware of where things are at this moment in time and give these people enough ammunition to fight for us, otherwise we're walking blindly into something. Please join the debate.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Shotts. Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Chair, Conference. I think it's well known by most people in the room that HMP Grampian constituted almost a third of the shortfall in staffing across the estate. Now, we have been the only establishment that has remained in a pre-COVID roster because we simply couldn't put a backshift together. Mark Meikle, SNC member has come to us and is well aware of the shortfall that we have. I support us going back to an early shift/backshift shift pattern, but we just simply couldn't do it. There is no way that we could safely allow our

members to walk into an area where there's one member of staff turning up for a backshift. Just wouldn't happen. Happy to have the debate.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Low Moss.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Conference, SNC. I'd just like to reiterate what Shotts was saying there. It's important we don't sleepwalk or feel pressurised into any sort of day shift. It's also important to realise that when you condense your shifts like that you're leave entitlement lessens as well. I think it's as much as nine days leave you would lose over that. It's an important thing to remember. We are very resistant to that at Low Moss. I understand that every branch has got its own anomalies etc. it's not for us to speak for other branches but certainly at Low Moss we'll be resisting that all the way.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Low Moss. Anyone else? Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates. Our bosses at Glenochil didn't want to go back to an early shift/backshift. They were adamant just working as a day shift. We went, 'No, we're going back to an early shift/backshift.' And we knew the issues and we knew the problems and we still have them. I think on average we are between 14 and 19 officers short on a backshift, so we have a hybrid kind of working situation where the PTs allowed to go out if there's enough staff and visits will not be cancelled. Well, it's hardly ever been cancelled so that continues, but the numbers are not high. But we do have a push from our senior management to say that we have to have purposeful activity in the evening, there's got to be something because we've got staff coming in on the backshift. And what everybody's saying about this debate, and Malky's quite right, they are looking to change this; they want a core day, fits their ask, chances are it'll be a seven-till-seven and then they'll start bringing in 12-hour

shifts, which folks said, 'Oh, we didn't want that.' They wanted that opportunity in POP to bring that in, we shouldn't be walking into this, should've seen that. I did early shift/backshift for 20-odd years, didn't like them sometimes and sometimes I did, but they're a core part of what we do. It allows us to deliver everything that they require us to do through that day. If you try and squeeze it into the middle, and we are finding at Glenochil, you can only squeeze it so much before the toothpaste goes everywhere. Please join the debate and let's make sure this doesn't happen.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Glenochil. Anyone else wishing to join the debate? John Devine on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Chair, Conference. Not to repeat, underestimate or even undermine anything that's already been said, I'll try and keep this brief and to the point. This debate is around the need to return to pre-COVID attendance patterns. That was influenced by the fact that the pre-COVID attendance patterns underpin establishment complements and that's already been highlighted by some of the branches. This means that these attendance patterns directly influence the number of workers that the employer has on their books. In short, as a union we're protecting jobs, which is a fundamental aim and objective of any trade union.

Just to take you back, the set of circumstances that led to the change to the day shift was the pandemic. Let's not forget that. This change was framed in a temporary agreement. The SNC managed, at the start of the pandemic, to secure a commitment from the employer that the change would be temporary. Once the set of circumstances that led to the temporary arrangement had changed back to the original state, then the temporary arrangement would no longer apply. Some members may wonder why the arrangement had to be temporary. I think that's already been covered with some of the branches as well. The simple answer – we're

protecting complements and thus protecting jobs and employment. As I said previously there, we're upholding the aims and objectives of the trade union.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks John. Thanks for the debate. Motion 53 – Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, SNC, Conference. The motion states: That any proposed shift pattern changes are voted on locally. Each establishment shift patterns differ and it would be unfair for a national vote encompassing all establishments.

Like the debate, every establishment works different. The backshift and the early shift. What we're actually stating here is let the establishment decide what shift pattern we're doing, let the branches decide, not nationally. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Edinburgh. Have a seconder for that motion? Castle Huntly, wish it speak? Anyone else wish to speak?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [31:02 IA] 53 and 54, are they not contradictory? Edinburgh was going up asking, which we all knew anyway, which [31:13 IA] in all establishments go back to pre-COVID [31:19 IA].

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Yeah, they are contradictory but that's the point of the debate to be had.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's not a debate, it's a moving motion though, eh?

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Yeah, but it's the contributions to the debate that shall lead to the outcome of them.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [31:46 IA]

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: No. No, it wouldn't fall because the motion we're currently on is to ensure that local establishments do their own attendance effectively and it's not covered here, and 54 is that they all return to pre-COVID attendance. They might look similar but 53 is to ensure that we don't interfere ongoing with attendance patterns. 53 – anyone else wishing to speak on the motion? Karen Ewen on behalf of the SNC.

KAREN EWEN – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC. Colleagues, we would like to thank Edinburgh for this motion and we do fully support it. Although it is already current practice, evidenced by each establishment already having their own unique shift patterns that suit them, we would always encourage local branches, and their senior management team, to sort their own shift patterns. We know that one shift pattern doesn't fit all and we would always look to local branches to endorse the shift patterns for their own establishments. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Karen. Edinburgh, right to reply. All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 54 – Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, SNC, Conference. The motion states: That we demand all establishments return to pre-COVID working patterns and agree regimes. This should be done and agreed and stop the introduction of a core day through the back door.

Like what we've been doing and speaking about, we need to return to the early shift/backshift. This back door core day is not happening. Like we're saying, we're going to start doing 12-hour shifts and we don't actually want that. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Edinburgh. Do

we have a seconder for the motion? Castle Huntly. Wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Karen Ewen on behalf of the SNC.

KAREN EWEN – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC. Colleagues, we ask that you reject this motion on the grounds of debates and speakers that have been previously. We would not nationally agree any shift patterns. We also encourage local branches to endorse the shift patterns for their own establishments. Some establishments have been forced to work different shift patterns due to safety issues and nationally we ask to ask them to alter those shift patterns that would put the health and safety of our members and prisoners at risk. We do, however, recognise that these shift patterns are not always ideal but it's a position that the local branches and their management teams have put in place to keep our members safe and we have to support those decisions. Please reject this motion, thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Karen. Edinburgh, right to reply. All those in favour of the motion. All those against. Motion's lost. Motion 55 – Edinburgh. Conference, permission to withdraw the motion? Motion's withdrawn. Motion 56 – Low Moss.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Conference, SNC. Motion 56 reads: That in any future pay negotiations where a reduction in rostered hours is proposed as part of any proposed pay deal settlement, that reduction in hours is passed on to staff in annual leave entitlement rather than a reduction of rostered hours on a week-to-week basis.

This motion was proposed at and accepted at a lockup we had, and to be honest, I struggled to understand it myself initially. Effectively this is to do with Scottish government's Public Sector Pay Policy, giving employers the discretion to reduce the working week to 35 hours. What they propose or are suggesting is that if the SPS were to go in that direction our members wouldn't feel the benefit of that reduction as the

employer would simply adjust the start and finishing times of each shift with staff not feeling any material difference. However, a reduction in two hours a week equates to 104 hours over the entire year, and if those hours were then exchanged for the equivalent in annual leave, which is a full 14 days, staff would then be able to use that leave and feel the benefit of that particular reduction. So, we're asking you to support that motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Low Moss. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Castle Huntly. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? John Devine on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Chair, Conference. The SNC are asking you to reject the motion. We can only assume that by rostered hours Low Moss means contracted hours. If a reduction was negotiated in contracted hours, let's say from 37 to 35, then our new contracted hours would be 35 hours. What the motion is seeking is for the two hour reduction to be converted back to annual leave entitlement. This would then increase the contracted hours back to 37 hours, as leave is a value and is paid. Any new 35 hour week would be inclusive of your annual leave entitlement, so for that purpose a simple calculation, it would equate roughly to 1,824 hours a year, an average shift length of seven hours and staff would maintain their current annual leave entitlement. If Low Moss are seeking an increase to annual leave entitlement, then we would ask them to return to Conference next year with something that we can work with, and that is why we're asking you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks John. Low Moss, right to reply. All those in favour of the motion. All those against. Motion's lost. Motion 57 – Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH CHAIR, EDINBURGH: Chair, SNC, Conference. As the motion states: The SNC

continue to negotiate with the employer to reduce to a 35 hour week.

Please support this motion. As previous motions we need to support this. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Edinburgh. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Glenochil. Wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Mark Meikle on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Chair, Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC in favour of this motion. The fact of the matter is that the motion is virtually already achieved. There is a commitment to continue to negotiate a 35 hour week and it's part of this year's pay offer, so technically the motion's already been achieved. However, we should be mindful that this comes at a cost, as Malky's already alluded to, quite simply by starting a wee bit earlier or a wee bit later can reduce your working week which does, in effect, reduce complements and therefore can affect shift patterns. So, whereas we want to achieve it, and I'm aware of anomalies in different shift patterns, Glenochil at lunchtime and the way that other places work, it can be achieved quite simply. However, in other establishments it would potentially lead to a whole change in shift patterns. So, we're in support of the motion and we do want a 35 hour week, but an effective one if it means more time, an effective one if it means we finish early, not just one that cuts complements and therefore can change shift patterns to the detriment. We're in support of the motion, so please carry, because we will try and achieve this, however, we will be very mindful of how it's achieved. Please support.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Mark. Conference, just a wee pointer to clarify in there that what Mark said there about 35 hours being achieved, it's actually not achieved yet, it's part of the pay claim and if the pay claim is accepted then it'll be 35 hour as part of that. Just to clarify that there. Edinburgh, right to

reply. All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 58 – Shotts.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference. I just want to read this motion out but things have moved and I'll come to that in a second. The motion reads: That Conference mandates the SNC to review the current application of the Absence Management Policy with SPS as it is currently a load of bureaucratic nonsense and I want to remind HR that they are advice givers not decision makers.

I'm going to ask permission to withdraw this motion because I believe that the SNC are actually reviewing it as we speak. When I put the motion in they weren't. Permission to withdraw please.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Conference, looking for permission to withdraw that motion. Motion's withdrawn. Motion 59 – Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates. The motion reads: That this Conference mandate the SNC to engage with the SPS to seek to negotiate a single Absence Management Policy and guidance document that fully incorporates probationary staff into that policy, and those absences are treated under the terms of that policy.

We had an anomaly that highlighted something to us; we had probationary staff who were still scoring on a points system that we went, 'Where's that come from?' 'It's under the new recruits, they are covered under that.' 'No, we've switched across to a new AMP policy, they surely must be covered under that.' 'No, no, we are keeping this other policy that we had in the background that nobody had access...' well, you had access to but you had to go hunting for it on SharePoint, to then find out that new recruits were still getting scored, and it was on the basis of you can't get more than 50 points. Myself and my colleague sat at a table discussing this and went, 'But the AMP policy actually allows you to work out how it

does with probationers, just the same as it does with any member of staff. We shouldn't be treating them any differently.' 'Ah, but we need a score.' And this is what we said at the meeting, 'We need a score because if they're no good we need to get rid of them.' That's what the PPMS says, that's what the reporting system is and that's what also should be done through the AMP policy. We shouldn't be scoring new recruits because their sick record's bad and it could be for anything, COVID, you name it, a car crash, whatever else, 'Sorry, you've scored more than 50 points, we're binning you.' We need staff, we should be working through them. We need to make sure that we have covered all of our staff under one policy, we don't have a tag onto the end of it, so please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Glenochil. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Perth, wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Willie Carle on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Conference, we're asking you to support this motion. We feel the Absence Management Policy, as it stands, has the flexibility to include probationary staff with some minor adjustments that would alleviate any management concerns and give support to probationary members. So we're asking you to support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Willie. Glenochil, reply? All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 60 – Perth. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Shotts. Wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Willie Carle, who's just got to his seat, on behalf of the SNC.

<Laughter>

WILLIE CARLE – SCOTTISH NATIONAL COMMITTEE: Conference, happy to support the motion as already

agreement with the management and unions to review all policies within three years, an average of seven a year. This is only correct that we review these policies to ensure that all policies comply with partnership principles but also changes in the law, therefore we're going to ask you to support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Willie. All those in favour of the motion. Motion's carried. Motion 61 – Dumfries. Conference, permission to withdraw. Not accepted.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [48:57]

<Laughter>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Do we have a seconder to the motion? Shotts. Wish to speak Shotts?

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Oh yes!

<Laughter>

Chair, Conference. Love this motion. Long overdue! Let's face it, colleagues, we're working in an equal opportunities organisation, some are more equal than others, eh? because what's came quite clear on this one is that using this to work from home, when operational staff have no choice but to come to work every single day 24/7, but non-operational can work from home. They're even using this for some of the HRPBs, for example, who caught COVID could work from home when they had COVID, but a member of staff who catches COVID now has actually got to report sick! So, this motion has actually got loud and clear to these people that it's not an equal opportunities organisation anymore because they're getting something that we cannot possibly achieve as operational staff. It's about time people came up here and tell these people, 'Enough!' That's why we demand a different salary, that's why we want to demand that we get back our operational lead again, because that's what we deserve, colleagues.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Shotts. Anyone else wishing to speak? Jim McCabe on behalf of the SNC.

JIM MCCABE – SCOTTISH VICE CHAIR: Chair, Conference on behalf of the SNC asking you to reject this motion. The motion reads discrimination. It's not discrimination. It doesn't meet one of the characteristics of the Equalities Act. It is unfair. And I take what John's saying, but on the surface it looks unfair. John's talking about what's the potential of happening, but if we read the motion, 'To work from home during illnesses'. First of all, if you register sick you shouldn't be working from home, you cannot get paid twice; if you phone in sick whether you're operational or non-operational, you're sick. So, management have got to be aware that when you're sick you shouldn't be required to work. The problem we have is operational staff are required in a gaol because of responders. We don't want them working from home. We want them in the gaol; if an incident happens they are going to be there to help out their colleagues.

Getting back to what Shotts says, you're right, in as much as if other policies are now invented that allow non-operational staff to facilitate a disconnect or any of this other stuff, that's all part of our job evaluation process, that we spoke about at the beginning of the Conference, that allows the National Committee to go to management and say to management, 'Too clear different contracts in employment.' However, with regards to the motion, I'll ask you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Jim. All those in favour of the motion. All those against. Abstentions. Need to do this again because there's people not put their card up for any of the three. All those in favour of the motion. All

those against the motion. Motion's carried.
Motion 62 – Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates. Motion reads: This Conference request the SNC seek to negotiate that during periods of significant shortages of staff local establishments are able to hold local promotion boards from C to D rather than having to rely on national boards, which is kind of run back to potentially mid-nineties, I think.

This came to light because we recently had an operational group of staff that were waiting seven months. They were going for promotion and because there was a lack of assessors and an inability to dial into something or get things, things were put back and it actually meant that their promotion boards and the things to go forward were kept taking back. Now, we had then had the situation where we've got operational staff who are operational officers acting up and getting act up money, which is derisory to say the least, for nearly a year. because in the policy you can work six months and then if there's a requirement it can be extended for a further six months. So they can go a full year on a derisory amount of money because we can't promote them, because we can't move them on because the system that we've got in place doesn't allow for our senior management, even at a local level or in a trifectum between three establishments if they want to [55:11], to say, 'We can promote these people.' And sometimes, now I'm digressing I'll grant you, they can't even get past the values based interview when they work for the SPS. That's bonkers! Absolutely madness. Please support this motion, thanks very much.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Glenochil. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Inverness, wish to speak?

ROBERT LEES – BRANCH CHAIR, INVERNESS: Chair, SNC, colleagues. I totally support this motion. From an Inverness point of view our geographical location makes it ideal for us to do it locally. Our experience is

that a few weeks ago six of us went down to the college and we were offline for two weeks and Inverness suffered; because it's a smaller establishment it had a detrimental effect on the gaol. Thanks very much, please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Inverness. Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Chair, Conference. I would ask you to reject the motion based on local boards and it goes down with if your face fits then you'll get your promotion, if your face doesn't fit who's actually going to be sitting on these boards at the local level? It's open to lots of discrimination, as far as I can see. What we actually need is an independent body looking at promoting staff and using the PPMS as it has always been designed for, natural progression, identifying individuals that have got certain skills who have, through their career files, PPMS has never looked at when we look at promotion for individuals. So, I'd ask you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Grampian. Anyone else wishing to speak? Greenock.

DON MCGRORY – DELEGATE, GREENOCK: Asking you to reject the motion. Just like Grampian says. I want you to remember when SSR come in in the local promotion boards and how corrupt the local boards were. We all remember the old SOs and old scores getting settled, the good members of staff getting told to go. Then when the local promotion boards came in other staff got promotions depending on the right getalong gang, played golf with the right people, supported the right football team, part of maybe a certain organisation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [58:49]

DON MCGRORY – DELEGATE, GREENOCK: Oh aye, you're doing well.

<Laughter>

Now, the national promotion process is a long-winded farce, but local promotion board certainly isn't the answer. Reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Greenock. Anyone else wishing to speak on the motion? Jim McCabe on behalf of the SNC.

JIM MCCABE – SCOTTISH VICE CHAIR: I don't know how to follow that by the way. <Laughs> Chair, Conference, speaking on behalf of the SNC. We are going to ask you to reject the motion as well for most of it was said with the last couple of people.

It was national level that argued for years for fair and open competition and we now want to reduce this back to the farce, is the best word I can use, a local board. I kind of get what Glenochil's saying with regards to we've got staff there and we need them, however, there's other staff that's been through a process and they've got their ticket and they're sitting there and maybe they live in Glasgow but work in Polmont and they want nearer Barlinnie. If we just keep promoting everybody in Barlinnie staff are never going to get moved near their place of work. I think the organisation Donny was talking about was the Scouts, I think, was it? <Laughs> Was it the Scouts you were telling me last night?

<Laughter>

So, in short, colleagues, I'd ask you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Jim. Glenochil, right to reply.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: I fully get it. I fully understand this farce, the corruption of local boards and all the rest of it, but we are living in cloud cuckoo land if we think it's not happening nationally. People go for national boards for promotion and their cards are already marked before they

even get there. What we need is, and I get it and if this motion falls that's fair enough, we'll come back so it gets reworded or something else. What we need to look at is the promotion system and the way that it actually works. Grampian was quite correct, PPMS, it used to be the whole fit for promotion, unfit for promotion, go back, work your way through but something needs to be done. If it's not this then fair play we'll work it, reword it and come back to it. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHAIR: Thanks Glenochil. All those in favour of the motion. Motion's lost. No, sorry. All those against.

<Laughter>

Motion's lost.

<Laughter>

Conference, we're going to stop for tea/coffee break. It's across in the Regency Room as it's been all week. If you can come back at 11:20.

TAYAV006 starts:

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you. Motion 63, Perth.

ANDY BROWN – BRANCH CHAIR, PERTH: Chair, Conference, the motion reads, the SNC engage with the employer at a faster transition through operational pay bands to enhance the retention and recruitment of staff. Everybody's the same, the staff retention. I don't think we're as bad as the English service, to be fair, but it's still drastic. So, anything that maintains our staffing level and is a bonus for the staff, is getting our staff onto a higher pay level making their terms and conditions better at an earliest opportunity. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Perth. Conference, do we have a seconder? Glenochil, do you wish to speak?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: Chair, SNC, delegates, I was looking at this motion and I was thinking to myself the wording and whatever, but I can see the efficacy of what they're wanting to do in the sense that they're wanting to say we should not be sitting, like we have at our establishment, seven months to go for a promotion. Some even longer. Or, the farce that happens if you go for a specific board, pass everything and fail your final interview you have to do it all again, because you want for a specific job and you can't sit the ticket and get another job that would allow you to get promotion, because you went for a specific role. We need to look at this across the board and maybe part of it is what Perth's proposing is that we get the promotions done when we need them, as we need them to make sure that staff stay in this job. Because we are losing them and we're losing them at the tail end with folk going out with capability and we're losing them at the start, because people just look at it and say, 'I'm going to get nowhere fast. I'm going to get a job somewhere else.' So, please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Any other speakers? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks, Conference. We're in favour of the motion. I'm not sure I've properly understood the contribution of Glenochil in terms of what it is that you're seeking for in this. But our take of that motion from Perth is that we're talking about shorter travel time between the bottom of the band to the top of the band. These are the kind of things that feature in just about every pay claim that we ever submit. You can see the submissions that we put in whenever we submit the pay claims to the organisation. And one of the things that we're constantly looking to do is reduce the travel times in the pay bands and it's an active feature of every negotiation we're involved in, including the one that we're still negotiating at the moment. It will be back in for the pay submissions again, next month, probably, we're that close to the next set of pay

talks, but if we don't achieve anything this time around, then we'll go back and try again the time around. So, I'm happy to support the motion if we've got the right understanding, Perth. You might want to clarify?

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Phil. Perth, would you like to reply? All those in favour of the motion? The motion's carried. Motion 64, Edinburgh. Do we have a seconder? Perth. Perth, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Phil Fairley on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks, Conference. I'm going to ask you to reject the motion. I think, the debate around why we're going to ask you to reject the motion actually, already happened. The reason that the two motions are still on the paper, just to clarify, is that one, we're looking to do the same thing, but for a specific set of circumstances. This one's looking to do it as a temporary permanent move. The reasons given by those who spoke on the previous motion are the reasons that I would ask you to reject it. If those of you who have been around long enough will remember actually, the process we've got in place came about from the trade unions being the ones that took it to management to ask to do it the way that they're doing. And the reason for that was because doing it locally there was no fairness, there was no openness, there was no transparency. There was a concern about the route that has been taken to get promotion at a local level and for a whole set of reasons that wouldn't have matched fair and open competition. So, the circumstances behind this process we've got in place now, came from pushes from the trade unions to take it there and I would ask you to reject it.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Phil. All those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion is lost. Motion 65, Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Chair, Conference, the motion that this Association actively pursues that all

establishments are fully complemented at the appropriate grades, as defined in the TUS Partnership agreement figures. So, a bit of background to this. We've spoke a bit already about leave entitlement and the complements not being revisited for several years, which makes the position even worse for us in HMP Grampian. Like I said before, we constituted almost a third of the shortages across the estate and we still experience severe shortages in establishments where we've now introduced voluntary lateral transfers. The second variable's never been changed, the credit variable's never been changed. And all these act-ups that we've got only provide savings for the organisation through pension payments. Act-up staff not being paid commensurate for the role that they perform. They have to perform all the duties of that post, but they don't get the pay that's commensurate with that position. And then there's the safety aspects where we're asked to perform all the roles, cover all the posts, do everything that's required within the establishment, but with less and less staff. The situation for us in HMP Grampian ...and I now know that it's spreading across the estate, as lots of you out there are experiencing the same difficulties as we have now and I fully appreciate that and I would ask you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Do I have a seconder for the motion? Castle Huntly, thank you. Do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Willie Carle on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: Conference, we're happy to support this motion, but I'll state for your information though, as it stands, there is recruitment issues across the whole service and even the police service has seen a significant drop in applications. As such, the pool we're fishing in is getting smaller at this time. A new campaign has started to attract new staff with adverts going out on the radio and in the press. I can assure you estates management is also desperate to get staff, with new establishments on the horizon, plus the leavers and the variable issues we have. It's a major issue with serious

implications that we are facing. As such, we will continue to push for a complemented post to be filled through the Operational Staff Movement Group and the Workforce Planning Group and any other means possible. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Willie. Grampian, right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? The motion's carried. Conference, just to take a small break from the agenda to do the, probably, hardest bit of conference, it's the obituaries. Obviously, we've not been at conference from 2019, so we have a list. So, if you're able, if I could ask you to be upstanding, we'll go through the names and then we'll observe a minute's silence. John Shannon, honorary life member. Stuart **Howhills**, Barlinnie. Andrew May, Barlinnie. Steven Fleming, Carstairs. Stuart Hanna, Dumfries. Alexander Ferries, Dumfries. Craig Jackson, Dumfries. Phil **Latocho**, Edinburgh. Jordan Russell, Edinburgh. Susan Mackeson, Glenochil. William Gibson, Greenock. Steven Carr, Greenock and Colin Steele, Perth.

<A minute's silence>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you. Motion 66, Perth. Could I have a seconder? No seconder, motion ...Castle Huntly, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks, Conference. We should probably, start first of all with an apology. We probably, should have got in touch with you through standing orders and helped with the wording in this motion. Your first and second sentences are pretty much the same thing, so we probably, could have tidied that up before we went for it. However, the motion itself we're going to ask you to remit, rather than give unqualified support for it and that's not because we don't have unqualified support for the campaign, but it's asking that the SNC pursue this. I think and as Joe has highlighted just when he addressed Conference, this isn't just a matter for the SNC,

it's a matter for every single one of us in the POA. We will continue to actively pursue a retirement age of 60 for prison officers, but we expect and hope that we can get that effort put in by everybody in this trade union. We need to get members aware of the need to get in touch with their elected politicians, both at Westminster and in Holyrood. Attend their surgeries, write to them and make the case to them. There's a rally in London next week, some of which is about the retirement age, so we've got members from the NEC who will be attendance at that. We've got members from down south who will be attendance at that. That's the kind of thing that we need to all be getting ourselves involved in. It's the kind of thing that we all need to be making the case to the people who have got the ability to change the outcome for this. So, I can assure you there's 100% commitment at this table to do it, but we're remitting it, because we want to make sure that the message gets out there that the responsibility for that doesn't lie at this table or the NEC's table. It lies with every single one of us in the POA, so I'd ask you to remit it.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Perth, do you accept the remit? Conference, all those in favour of the motion? Sorry, all those in favour of the remit? OK, thank you. That's the motion remitted, thanks. Motion 67, Dumfries.

BRIAN ALISON – BRANCH DELEGATE, PLR, DUMFRIES: Chair, Conference, Motion 67 reads that, 'This Conference condemns MyCSP and SPS Pay Section for their inability to process members' pensions in a timely manner, as some members are having to wait months after retirement for payment.' I'm sure we've all come across this with members that have retired and they're having to wait. Some are waiting two, three, four ...we've had one waited nine months and the one I'm going to speak a wee bit about, waiting six months. She only just got a payment a couple of weeks ago. Now, I get there was complications with this one's pension, because there used to be what was called a temporary female officer, when we got female prisoners in they were called in. So, there was

complications around about the contract, but there had been other staff that had retired on these contracts before. So, it was nothing new. They knew what was coming. She applied for her pension through the proper channels and in appropriate time, retired on 31st of March and as I say, two weeks ago, that's when she got her pension through. That's not good enough. That's not good enough. People are having to dig into their investments and money that they've put aside for their future. They're having to use credit cards to pay for stuff. That's not on. This is their money, they're due it after all these years' service and that's how we're going to treat them. There's a constant thing the Pay Section getting to them, their inability to get back to them. Just no replies whatsoever for about four months, until eventually we got Mark, kindly got to intervene. The girl went up there and spoke to Mark. Mark had a bit of intervention, the Pay Section got their act together, then we had to get onto my CSP and thanks to Joe Simpson and Joe managed to get onto them and try and sort something out. Your members deserve better than this. All these years' service and we cannot sort out their pensions for them. And they're having to dig into credit cards and savings. It's just not good enough, so please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks Dumfries. Shotts to second.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Fully supporting this motion. We have had colleagues who have been out nearly a year before they got their pension. But what I'd like to say on the back of this, this is what happens when the Tory party cut public services, because there's not enough people that actually know what they're doing anymore at myCSP. And the motion that I put forward earlier asking for a resettlement officer, this ties in exactly for that reason. We've got a member of staff just now who's off ill from work related stress, because his pension went through and it went through Pay Section and went to myCSP and then he got told last week ...two weeks ago he got told he owed them £20,000 back,

because they got it wrong. There's a disconnect from the establishment, from the member of staff who's retiring and from myCSP. And the problem that we've been finding, as I says earlier, is you're waiting anywhere between 30 minutes to a couple of hours to get through to these people and they don't know what they're doing. And then what they do at the back of that is they then pass it back to Pay Section and Pay Section pass it back to HR and HR don't know any of the answers, because there's nobody there to tell them what they're supposed to be doing. So it then goes back to say, in Pay Section who says, 'It's not our issue, it's myCSP.' And myCSP are coming back and saying, 'It's actually, the organisation's issue.' But these people, as it was pointed out by Dumfries, are getting left to flounder. These people have given year after year up to 30, 35 years' service and they're getting no support. This is not right in this organisation. They're getting left alone to carry on themselves and they are going into their savings. These are people who are expecting ...and this is a process, 'I'm retired, give us my money.' It's as simple as that. But for some reason, this is getting really dragged out. Please support the motion, colleagues.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts. Anyone else wishing to speak on the motion? Phil Fairlie on behalf of the SNC.

PHIL FAIRLIE – SCOTTISH ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY: Thanks, Chair. I understand and we recognise actually, everything that's just been described by the two branches that have spoken on this motion. We've got individuals at this table who have been involved in personal cases themselves, who have been dealing with those issues at length. But we're going to ask you to remit the motion and we're going to ask you to remit it, because we're talking about two different groups here. We're talking about myCSP and I have to say, I don't think any of us are going to stand here and attempt to make a case for myCSP in terms of the way it's managed. Far too many of our membership who have been in this position and the way they've been shoddily

treated and the consequences of that have been significant in some cases. So, there's no defence of that from this table. We're a bit less comfortable to take the same approach with the SPS Pay Section and that's not to say that we don't think that they get it wrong at times, they do. It's not to say that they haven't taken time over dealing with some of those cases, we know they have. But we also know that they're not some faceless entity. When you describe them as a group and a section in that way, it's easy to dismiss who they are. They're our SPS colleagues, who we know personally, who we deal with on a regular basis dealing with cases and individual's circumstances. In the vast majority of those cases we get a very, very good response, we get a good outcome from dealing with the staff in that group. We know the group itself has had their own challenges. It's a very small group of staff that have been asked to manage this. And actually, John described some of the responses he's got back. They get the runaround the same as we do, the same as others do. So, we're cautious about taking the same kind of language. Condemning them is pretty strong language in any case for Conference. It's not a language that we're comfortable with using about Pay Section. And actually, we recognise that they haven't got it right on every occasion, but none of that's to do with a lack of care or a lack of concern for the work that they're doing and we know that in a personal capacity from dealing with them. So, we would ask you to remit it. We'd be doing it on the basis that we've got no attempt to defend myCSP in this in any shape or form. We're a bit less comfortable with doing that with the Staff Pay Section.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Phil. Dumfries, do you accept the remit? Conference, do you accept the remit? Thank you, that motion's been remitted. Conference, the next motion 68, is a composite removed by the SNC and seconded by Barlinnie. John Devine on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Chair, Conference, the motion reads, 'Conference instructs the SNC to reaffirm its commitment from the SPS

to establish a job evaluation tool and pay structure that is fit for purpose. One that is able to properly capture the complexities and challenges of the operational front-line roles in the service, which in turn allows those roles to be accurately measured, valued and rewarded.’ Conference, by supporting this motion you will allow us to continue pursuing this issue. The issue has been mentioned in previous motions at Conference about the operational front-line. Also, as part of the multi-year pay award, we can all recall part of that the SPS agreed to scope alternative pay structures. It doesn’t give me any pleasure or the SNC any pleasure to actually say that during the subsequent pay talks, as pay negotiators, we actually failed to make any progress on this matter. In order to move this forward we ask for the support from Conference, so we can reinvigorate our efforts to expediate the process and find a reasonable solution to this ongoing issue. Just to give you a wee bit of background on where the current situation lies, the current pay structure within the SPS relies on a job evaluation tool that is in our minds and, in the employer’s mind, not fit for purpose. And it has little or no credibility. Some would go as far as to say that the job evaluation tool has been corrupted and it fails to take into consideration the true and unique nature of the prison officer role. It also fails to take cognisance of several contractual differences that exist between operational and non-operational staff within the service. And just for the record, see those operational differences, they do not constitute discrimination. The current job evaluation tool, it was adopted over 20 years ago and for some of you, you may not be aware that the tool itself was called EQUATE. The employer made their position clear during a previous formal review of the EQUATE system. And during this formal review, it was around July 2017, it was agreed by the SPS that a paper would be produced setting out the reasons why the SPS is minded to replace the current job evaluation scheme. The paper that this produced by the employer highlighted a clear rationale why the current EQUATE system needed to be replaced. The rationale for change according to the employer was captured in a number of

statements. One of the statement was that EQUATE is no longer supported by KPMG and is therefore a security risk. To back that statement up it went on to say, ‘It is vital to the SPS that all software that we operate is supported by the vendor to protect the organisation from cyber-attack. Further, to qualify for PNN accreditation and therefore, have the ability to share essential sensitive data with the police.’ The EQUATE system can’t be hosted on the SPS network. As a workaround the software has been placed on a standalone computer. However, this means that SPS can’t ...due to it being locked down by the vendor and because of its age, makes the job of transferring it to another computer complex and requiring specialist skills and equipment. For this reason alone, the system will have to be replaced. Another point from the review was that, ‘EQUATE no longer fits with the work performed by SPS employees.’ A third point, ‘EQUATE does not fit with recruitment.’ And finally a fourth point was, ‘There is an inability to adapt Equate.’ One of the options discussed during the review was to bring EQUATE up to date. However, that was not possible and it was not possible to adapt the current system to bring it up to date due to the software. And this actually, makes it difficult to operate the system. Also, adding to that, there was an audit report from 2005 and it identified, ‘The software and benchmarking tools are not fit for purpose.’ One of the recommendations from the audit was, ‘HR should revise and review the current system or introduce a new job evaluation system.’ It was identified as, ‘A high risk’ and the recommendation was endorsed by our employer. Based on this information there’s probably only one conclusion, there is a clear rationale for replacing EQUATE. So, it looks like based on the information we have, is that we’re pushing an open door. But that open door may be at the end of a long corridor and that long corridor may have some boobytraps along the way. Please support the motion and allow us to continue the work on behalf of our members.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, John. Barlinnie?

MICK MULHOLLAND – BRANCH CHAIR, BARLINNIE: Conference, Chair, John's covered all aspects of it, to be honest, so all I can ask you is to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Barlinnie. Any other speakers? All those in favour of the motion? The motion's carried. Motion 69, Barlinnie. OK, Conference, permission to withdraw? OK, the motion's withdrawn. Motion 70, Shotts.

ALAN STUART – BRANCH SECRETARY, SHOTTS: Chair, SNC, Conference, the motion reads that Conference recognise our members have little trust or faith in the current staff grievance policy and how easily it's manipulated by management in order to not uphold the grievances. We mandate the SNC to review whether the current policy is fit for purpose with the SPS. Conference, we've all seen it, we've all been involved in a grievance or two or three or four. We have management doing all they can to manipulate statements, words used or circumstances in order to do all they can to protect fellow managers. Let me give you one example. One of our members took out a grievance after a certain manager had done everything in her power to reduce the chances of him getting a favourable outcome for a Section 11 application. Including, given her own medical opinion when she's not qualified. The manager who heard the grievance proceeded to use a dictionary to find alternative meanings to the words used in the grievance. Our member's integrity was attacked and the manager could find no evidence of physical assault, because he had manipulated the words. Our member thought that was an abuse of power that the manager could find no evidence of verbal abuse or sexual abuse, manipulating the words, again. It was laughable and pathetic that the grievance wasn't upheld and it was only partially upheld on appeal. In effect, only a grievance which is not going to result in disciplinary action for a manager, has any chance of being fairly heard. Minor infringements of safety uphold cases or unacceptable behaviour on the part of management, that's when the wagons are

circled. This can't be right, so please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you, Shotts. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Glenochil, do you wish to speak?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: I fully support this motion. In a blunt nutshell, it's not working. We've had a member of staff who put a grievance in. I spoke and wrote to the unit manager in question multiple times and kept the email chain going for nine months. That was even after a second grievance went in about the first grievance. And then that unit manager decided to move jails and it's still not been actioned or heard. And that's just one of them. There's multiple times where it goes forward and you turn and say ... now, I'm going to touch on something, we actually, put a motion forward that was rejected by the Standards Committee, which tells that these individuals should be held accountable. And it was pointed out that they are also members, some are members, etc. But there should be something in place that says, 'This is a policy, it has a proceeding.' It goes through that and yes, it can be extended, because it says in the wording, 'This may be extended for extenuating circumstances' x, y or z. But that doesn't mean it runs on forever more, or as has been pointed out, it comes to a conclusion that it doesn't actually, come to a conclusion. Or, sits at a partially upheld and then the person sits and goes, 'But which bit actually works? Did I win this part or win that part?' It's a farce and the policy needs to be looked at and it actually, needs a bit of teeth added to it, because nobody wants to take a grievance out unless they feel they have to. The term, 'Grievance, I feel aggrieved, please listen to me.' So, please fully support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Low Moss?

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Conference, fully support the motion. We had a case in Low Moss last year it was, where a member was racially abused by his manager. And you

should have seen the wagons begin to circle there. They took it through the whole process, the grievance and everything and it wasn't upheld. We actually took it to an employment tribunal where it was upheld, but at great cost to that guy's mental health. He had to leave the organisation so much was his distrust of it due to the current grievance policy. So, please support this motion and don't allow other members to go down this road as well.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Low Moss. Grampian?

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: Chair, Conference, we urge you to fully support this motion. More and more throughout our organisation grievances are not upheld. Grievances for staff, who have a legitimate claim against the employer as soon as you've held your head up above the parapet, you're easy game. You're shot down. Your life is destroyed and turned inside out in order for them to disregard totally a legitimate grievance for a member of staff. I think, every one of you can point to an example of that throughout the estate and there's no reason why we should continue with a policy which is not fit for purpose. Again, I would call for an independent body to look at grievances within our organisation. How can it be right that the same people listen to an appeal from a grievance that's been held by them? They're listening to an appeal and deciding on the appeals and it's not right. There has to be an independent body or why would a member of staff go to the bother of raising a grievance against the employer and then, when they appeal it, the same people are knocking them back. It's not right. I urge you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Any other speakers? William Reid on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIAM REID – FINANCE OFFICER: Conference, we're asking for a remit here. And in fact, what we've heard about the things, we know it's flawed. The examples you've given shows there is a flaw in the process. But what we've got to be mindful of is the fact that

there's union involvement the whole way through, including when it comes to grievance appeals. So, we have to be mindful of that. And picking up the remit, we're saying that obviously, we're reviewing it, but I'll go back to motions that were earlier that we have a commitment of reviewing all the policies in SPS. But like we said, we're asking for the remit, because this motion doesn't just say that, it condemns it as well. And we've got to be mindful of the fact that we do have total involvement right from the beginning. So, if you're willing to accept the remit, we're admitting that we'll go back and we'll look at the policy as we do anyway, as we've mentioned previous so, Conference, we're asking for a remit and hopefully you can accept that.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, William. Shotts, do you accept the remit?

SHOTTS: Yeah.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thank you. Conference, do you accept the remit? Thank you, that motion's been remitted. Conference, we're just taking a break again from the agenda. I'd just like to introduce and welcome our Chief Executive, who's going to address Conference, Teresa Medhurst. Obviously, it's been a difficult tenure for you taking up at the beginning of COVID. This table and I think probably the wider trade union were delighted when we heard that you got the job substantively. It's a good captain to have at the front. So, it's been a difficult time for you, but we welcome you and we look forward to you addressing Conference. Thank you.

TERESA MEDHURST – SCOTTISH PRISON SERVICE, CHIEF EXECUTIVE: It's a long walk <laughs>. I was going to say, because I thought it was 12 o'clock, so you've caught me slightly off guard, but thank you, Chair and thank you, Conference for the invitation to come and speak to you today. It is a real honour and a privilege for me. This is my first POA Conference and certainly, I know it's the first one that's been held since I became Chief Executive, and it was really good when I

first came in to connect with people that I haven't seen for a while, those who are still working, but more importantly, those who aren't working, and although it's taken me a bit of time to recognise some of the faces, there are more that I know than I don't know. So, it's good to see you all here today and I hope Conference so far has been successful. I'm sure it has.

There are three issues I wanted to cover off today and I think I've got about half-an-hour and I probably will take that, if that's OK, Chair. Obviously, the recent challenges of the pandemic and partnership working; some of the challenges and opportunities that we face now and in the future; how we work together, which is really important, and that includes shifting the perception of the SPS and all of those who work in the organisation.

So, if I can take you back to the first lockdown in March 2020, I'm sure none of you want to go back there, because it was a particularly difficult time. It was necessary at that time, and I use the language wisely, but ended up basically, collapsing the working day. There was confusion. There was a degree of chaos and the fear, particularly as I walked round prisons, was real and palpable. It was also really precarious. There were predictions that hundreds of people in our prisons would lose their lives and that wasn't just those in custody, I'm talking about staff as well.

There were riots in prisons in Italy and as we looked on, we didn't know whether or not that was going to be our future as well. It was really uncertain and really unpredictable.

So what did we have to do? We agreed, in partnership, to prioritise three things. We prioritised safety, being responsive to people's needs and operational stability. And we delivered exceptionally well on all of those fronts.

How did we do so? We agreed governance arrangements, both nationally and locally, that was the National Coronavirus Response Group and the Local Coronavirus Response Groups

that created an agility and responsiveness to take in key decisions and nuance to local needs, and that was all done in partnership. It also created a forum for effective communication flow and this made sure that off-table discussions were able to be more effective in stabilising, both workforce and providing flexibility to meet needs either into childcare, supporting those with dependants, who are elderly or had additional needs and putting in place emergency payments in recognition of, both the personal and work pressures that were being experienced by staff across the organisation. In addition to that obviously, operational stability was critical and despite really, *really, really* restrictive conditions, operational stability has been maintained during the whole life of the last two-and-half-years. Mobile phones and virtual visits did play a part and I know that everyone across the service worked really hard to support that. Would I do that again in four months? Absolutely not, but it happened and it happened because everybody pulled together, they recognised the need, they recognised the urgency and the need to have it. For that, I will always be grateful. But the operational stability was mainly and almost solely delivered through the positive relationships between staff and those in our care. They were providing the assurance. They were ensuring key messages and communications were effective about changes that were taking place. They reinforced and identified simple but practical steps that were making a difference to those who were being locked up for long periods of time. Small things, but things like extra milk. Flexibility and adapting to the changing work patterns, the resilience evident during the ebb and flow of COVID outbreaks, the endurance to keep going when we had to go back into restrictions, when we had to start wearing face masks and the strength of relationships when I saw a shift in our population from compliance to cooperation. And it is testimony to the skills, the quality and the experience of our staff and your members and the strength of partnership working. That is the value of partnership. And when I look at what has been achieved in the SPS over the lifetime of the partnership

agreement, and then look in contrast at other jurisdictions and other prison employers, the facts speak for themselves. But it hasn't been achieved by itself. It's been through hard work, and it is really difficult, particularly at times of pressure, to maintain positive working relationships, but it is without doubt the case, that the Prison Officers Association and the Scottish Prison Service have evidenced that that is possible. And what we have achieved through partnership working is quite remarkable and we must never, ever lose sight of that.

Looking at some of the challenges we are facing just now and the future challenges, we talk of working together and maintaining positive relationships through challenging times. I'm not going to stand here and try to suggest that things aren't hard just now for you, for your families, for your members and their families. Inflation is high, the cost of living is rising continually. I'm sure, like me, you drive past petrol stations and every time you look it's gone up another point five or point seven or whatever. I know you're feeling it and your members are feeling it. The organisation is feeling it too.

2019, through partnership working, we negotiated a three-year pay deal, which was the best pay deal anywhere in the public sector, and how appropriate it was that your members benefitted from the best deal out there during the pandemic. The POAS is rightly trying to secure the best deal possible in the current context and I understand that. We would like to provide you with the deal your members deserve and we are striving to reach an agreement, but we are restricted to what we can afford to pay. However, discussions are ongoing and hopefully we'll retain the same positive engagement that has been in evidence up until now.

If I can turn to other resource challenges, I think John mentioned this yesterday, this financial year we started off with a budget deficit and we are experiencing really pressures from inflation, the implications of Brexit and the war

in Ukraine, and all of those are placing real pressure, both on our contracts, particularly around energy, food, etc. There are changes to our [46:35 end of year] position and it has improved and we're working really closely with the Scottish Government, but the current fiscal climate is so tight that we need to account for every penny, and we need to retain confidence in the SPS and this will take our collective effort.

A resource spending review was published on the 31st of May and sets out the priorities for spend for the government and justice is not a priority. So, for us this means a flat cash settlement, which is only an indicative allocation at this time. Budgets will continue to be set in the usual manner, so we're not clear yet what this means in reality. Some of you may have already read the written evidence that was submitted by SPS to the Criminal Justice Committee, which they published earlier this week in advance of the oral hearings which started yesterday. I will be attending Committee next week to give evidence on behalf of SPS. But the figures, the position across the justice sector, is very similar, in that we are all experiencing real difficulty in identifying how we can manage through next year without some shift and some recognition of the pressures that we are facing with regards to inflation. And one of the things that I have tried and am trying to do is ensure that I position us differently. We are a 24/7 365 days a year organisation, we cannot stop the flow. We are dependent on others with regards to the flow in and out of custody and we need to keep the lights on for the whole period. Therefore, we are different to ports, we are different to police, we are different to Scottish Fire and Rescue. However, you can watch it next week and see how I do.

So, how are we going to manage through the significant fiscal challenges and meet those whilst continue to work in partnership? What we can do is maximise on the learning from the last two years, two-and-a-half-years in meeting those challenges, because during a time when we have been facing the rigours and the

challenges of a pandemic, we have still been able to deliver on national priorities and strategies. And that has again, been done through really constructive partnership working. So, for example, the women's strategy. We've opened Liliac and Bella in the last couple of months. That has continued. These are world class facilities and they will set the SPS head and shoulders above other services, because they are so new and so innovative. In addition to that, in partnership, in recognition that we, at some point, will have to incorporate the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child into Scots law, we are piloting new physical interventions framework developed using the principle of non-pain-inducing restraint with young people and women. And again, that has only been possible through partnership working.

But we also face changing workforce expectations and demands and that's already impacting on our service and I know that you will be feeling that acutely in establishments at the moment, but we need to make sure that we invest in and create the flexible working conditions to maximise and diversify our workforce capability and capacity through meaningful engagement, empowerment and better support to make the increasing complexity of risks and needs evidenced in our population. So, the resource challenges are not small and we will debate at times. We will disagree how we're going to meet those challenges. But I know that we will find a solution and we'll come together, because that is what we do best and it's been my experience for the whole of the lifetime of the partnership agreement.

In terms of working relationships and shifting perceptions, regardless of current challenges and those that lie around the corner, we will always have more in common than what divides us. Both POAS and SPS want to create the best possible workplaces for our employees and your members. As a fair work employer we want our colleagues to be safe, we want to provide security of income, fulfilment and of belonging, the opportunity to flourish and to be

treated with respect and to promote wellbeing. I recognise that we can't achieve all of that without listening to the voice of our workforce, and the POA is the only trade union which speaks for prison officers. That is why it is important for me that the POA is also reflective of the workforce it represents and I was really encouraged to read John Cairney's article, which was put out earlier in the year when he announced a number of steps that you are taking to diversify the union, and I wish you every success in progressing that important work.

But what kind of organisation are we? And what kind of organisation do we want to become? We now have more women working in Scotland's prisons than ever before. A growing cadre of female leaders at all levels making a real difference to the day-to-day lives of people in our care. I maybe the first, but I'm sure I won't be the last female chief executive, but we cannot rest on our laurels. We still have work to do to become an organisation that is truly reflective of the communities that we serve, to attract talent from all of Scotland's communities, to be an attractive employer for all of Scotland's communities and to fill every vacancy in every prison. Just like John has set out for the POA, SPS must also act to create an inclusive workplace, so that everyone feels welcomed into our family. To achieve that we must maintain a respectful workplace where everyone is treated with dignity, where one person's banter isn't another person's harassment and where we speak to each other respectfully and refrain from personal abuse. I hope that you share these values and that you will support me in developing a culture in which we place relationships at the heart of all that we do.

In creating an environment within the organisation, what I'm looking to do, certainly, is to provide one where constructive challenge is welcome, where we view mistakes as an opportunity to learn, where we are committed to our ongoing development, and finally, where we recognise success and collaborate to create positive outcomes for those in our care. We

must all continue to maintain positive relationships and never take these for granted. It's also about engagement though, how we engage with each other. Real engagement is about asking sometimes difficult and crucial questions, questions that we don't necessarily have the answers to yet and nor do others. But questions such as how do we further improve what we do in the current economic climate with an increasing and challenging prison population? When money is tight and it will be in the years ahead, make no mistake about that, how do we run prisons that thrive and where those in our care can have the opportunities they need to turn their lives around? And where you and all our colleagues enjoy coming into work and feel fulfilled and respected? I understand we're not there yet and I hear that. But that's why our corporate planning, the expectations that we place on staff and our thinking around what we can achieve has to be realistic, has to reflect the fact that we now have more recruits going through the college than ever before, more officers taking maternity leave than ever before, and therefore align the limited resources we have available to the priorities that we are facing. Over the last two-and-a-half-years we have demonstrated our ability to innovate quickly and we need to maintain that so we can focus on the priorities and the challenging times ahead. In 2019 nobody would have believed the progress that we could make and there are further opportunities, particularly, around digitalisation. And Adam would not forgive me if I didn't mention that we will be going out very shortly to the market to purchase a new payroll service, which will allow us to streamline services, including the ex-gratia claim process. But the point is we need to enable prison officers to do what they do best, developing relationships with some of the most difficult and dangerous people in Scotland and putting the tools in place to allow them to transform their lives. But of course, we can't achieve this without a healthy workforce. Our wellbeing and resilience has never been more important. The people that work in prisons are real people who feel real emotions and who go through stressful periods in their lives. All too

often in the past this has been ignored; colleagues haven't felt safe opening up and talking about how they're feeling. Mental health is a priority for the SPS and we need to be clear that the days when opening up around mental health was a weakness are gone and will not return. We have an increasing range of activity and support mechanisms for colleagues and this will continue and must continue to develop further. It is incumbent on all of us to look after each other and I'm aware that POA also provides support mechanisms to members and PLRs provide support to their colleagues. We must work together to ensure this position of support and understanding becomes the norm and the outdated stereotypes regarding mental health becomes a thing of the past. And probably some of the most important memories that I carry of partnership working when it's worked well ...and I could talk about making changes in practice or policy in various prisons that I've worked in, but those things that stick with me are the times when I've worked closely with a PLR on an individual's case to ensure that that individual, if they have to leave the organisation, leaves the organisation in a way where they feel respected, where they are looking forward and they are not looking back. And that's not always easy to do, but it takes time and it takes that positive working relationship between ourselves in order to ensure that colleagues feel supported and not only within the organisation, but after they leave the organisation as well.

There is a perception of the SPS that we are the hidden service and we are, and wherever there is press coverage of SPS it still irritates me immensely to see prison officers being titled as wardens. I can't remember when it was the name warden was giving up, but I'm sure it must at least 50 or 100 years ago. So, some of that is about how we recognise and celebrate success within the organisation and share it with other partners. And it's also about how we highlight the good and positive work that we do. We're getting better, but there are still many stories that go untold, and that's basically because it doesn't matter where I go, who I'm speaking to, congratulating people for

exemplary work that they've done and the first response I get is, 'I was only doing my job.' And you must have heard it a million times as well. It's not only doing their job. What they do is remarkable and it should be celebrated. We had the Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans, Keith Brown, who's coming to speak to you shortly, visited three of our establishments this summer, Dumfries, Polmont and Grampian, and he went because of the excellent work that's going in our establishments, and he reflected back to me, on a personal level, how impressed he was by the professionalism of the staff that he met and impressed by the standard or work that's being delivered across prisons. He went to Dumfries to meet two staff who had saved a man when they were out on their lunchbreak, who they identified very quickly left his bag, went to the edge of the bridge and clearly understood that he was considering taking his life. They saved that man's life. They then went back to work and they didn't share that with anyone. And it just exemplifies for me how much our staff need to be encouraged to recognise when they step out with the norm and they do exemplary things and exemplary work. Saving someone's life is not the norm, it's quite unusual.

I also recently had the Scottish Courts and Tribunal Service board members visit three establishments, Glenochil, Shotts and Barlinnie, and I met with them afterwards. These are people who've worked in the justice system, Lady Dorrian, particularly. Eric McQueen is the Chief Executive, they've worked in the justice system for a long time. To hear how overwhelmed they were by the complexity of the work that they do, by the standard, by the quality of what we do, by the quality of our staff, really brought it home to me how little people know about our organisation and what we do and how much more we've got to do in order to ensure that people do understand, and they do recognise, the part that we play, not just in justice, but for the safety of Scotland. In addition to that I had the Permanent Secretary, the new one, JP Marks, visit Perth as well earlier this year. And again, for someone who came from, I think, it

was DWP down south and had visited prisons in England and Wales, but was really struck again, by the calmness, the order, but most of all the quality of work that was being delivered. So, if others can see it, we also need to recognise it for ourselves, and as PLRs you have a part to play in that. You need to promote, you need to support, need to encourage courage to accept the recognition for the work that they do and not hide their light. To the public we are the forgotten emergency service, the forgotten part of the justice system and we are trying to change that. We have got more presence on social media platforms. I have no idea how to work them, but somebody else does it for me. And it's things like that we need to encourage and promote as part of that sharing and broadening out of the understanding around the role that we play, the importance and get the same kind of recognition as other parts of the justice sector.

Finally, Chair, because I'm nearly finished, I just want to say something about the pandemic and the fact that, well, most people, when they retired during the pandemic had no gatherings or parties, unless, of course, you were working in Downing Street. But one of those who definitely left far too quietly was a founding father of the partnership agreement, who's sitting at the back of the room and who I met in the 1980s at Longriggend, and we've known each other for that long.

Andy Hogg was a POA representative at a time when union reps and management couldn't even sit in the same room together. No relationship, no trust, no respect and issues settled by imposition or unlawful strike action. Andy was a key figure in shaping an alternative way of working. Not only was he able to find successful resolutions, but he inspired others to do the same, and over many years he found joint wins to many a dispute that looked destined for deadlock. Andy made it look easy and he did, but that was because of his skills as a people person as a trade union representative. As for his record as a trade union negotiator, that speaks for itself. I was delighted to hear that you recognised this in making him an

honorary member of your union. His legacy also lives on in SPS, but it will only survive and will only continue to achieve the benefits for the SPS employees if we adopt his approaches and values and work hard to maintain them.

I'd also like to make mention of Mick Grattan, who's also sitting at the back there. And again, Mick, I remember marching in the quadrant behind you in the 1980s and we've known each other ever since. That again is someone who has worked tirelessly for members and probably does work still, even though his wife won't approve. And tirelessly for colleagues over many years, and who was also dedicated to fostering positive relationships. So, thanks very much to Andy and Mick and I very much hope that you're enjoying your retirements and enjoying Conference from the back of the room, instead of sitting at the front of the room. I'm sure it's a much more pleasurable experience.

I began this speech talking about the astonishing response to the pandemic but of course, it hasn't gone away. We are still in the recovery phase and it will continue to provide challenge, but we will continue to build on the opportunities it has presented. And although, it has proven our success and demonstrated that SPS staff are those who step up whilst others step back, we can and we must continue to build on that, to build the kind of prison service we need and deserve and which the whole of Scotland can be proud of. One with the core values of respect and diversity at its heart, because it is the work that you do, the work we do, the values you represent and the way you care for people, including your colleagues, that's what makes SPS the organisation that it is and that is why I am so proud to lead it. Thank you very much for your time this morning.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Teresa, just before you dash off, just, thanks for taking the time to attend the Conference, I know how busy you are, so I appreciate it. Welcoming to hear that somebody else struggles with social

media platforms, as do I, that's why I'm not anywhere. Just a couple of things from us to yourself was, a lot of the points you made there through your half-an-hour ...and I'm glad it took you half-an-hour, because we're rattling through our agenda so I'm glad you too half-an-hour. I cannot give them flyers when their bosses are in, because they'll be noting their hours. But a lot of the points you made have been actually, covered in our agenda throughout the Conference and we've still got a few more motions to come. So, they'll be encouraged that you've recognised them yourself and we look forward to having a dialogue and discussions about the matters that we have important and equally you have important. So, we welcome that dialogue when it comes. You made the point about the finances that, as a Chief Executive, the organisation that you're leading is facing. I don't think that we're foolish enough not to know that they're here and alive. So, as a trade union we would like to be in with you having those discussions, those difficult decisions that need to be made. We would like to be there to represent our membership and get our view across and I know the commitment is there through the partnership working that you've said, so, we do welcome that to come. A lot of the stuff that I was going to say you have touched on, so it's not it's ...I don't need to be contentious or re-agitate stuff. I know you've agreed to stay on for lunch and speak with delegates. You might regret that, depending on who gets your ear, but you're more than welcome to stay and we hope you stay as long as you can and we appreciate you addressing Conference. And Conference practice means you don't go away empty-handed. Like most good game shows, we've to a wee token of our appreciation for you attending Conference.

<Applause>

TERESA MEDHURST – SCOTTISH PRISON SERVICE, CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I was just going to say, what did Colin McConnell think of the flowers you got him.

<Laughter>

I just wanted to say it is a privilege to be here and to be in amongst you and I really welcome the opportunity. There is much more that we need to discuss and I understand that, but we're on a journey and we're going to get more done, more quickly, if we're on that journey together. But thanks very much for the gift, I appreciate it.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR:

Conference, before we go back onto the agenda, you'll remember yesterday that there was tickets put out for people to fill out on behalf of Group Life to have a raffle for a bottle of ...exceedingly expensive, bottle of malt, I'm led to believe. So, in a minute or two I'm going to invite Jenny up to do the raffle, but I just want to touch on Group Life. I know everyone in the room, the delegates, will know the importance of Group Life and what it offers, but it's just to reaffirm that message and the relationship that we've had with Group Life. Group Life actually, began when it was SPOA, so that gives you an idea to the length of time that they've been involved. So, it's over 40 years that they've been here. There's about only a third of our membership that are actually in this scheme. So, that gives you an idea of the kind of market that we have to speak to about it trying to get them to join in. The scheme itself has paid out over £7 million, which is sad, because that just shows you the amount of people that we've lost that were in the scheme. But it's £7 million that's went to those that have passed families or the members who have lost loved ones that have got the portion of it. So, I don't think we can lose the importance of what it is. For me and William, we speak to the new recruits and we always found it difficult to get new recruits, young recruits involved. But as we went through the obituaries we had a colleague, Jordan, from Edinburgh who passed away. He passed away at 23 and he was in the scheme and he left the money to his mum and dad that got the scheme. So, death doesn't discriminate and I think the message to take from this, we've got two-thirds of our majority of our membership that aren't in it. So, it's a

scheme that we have to push. We almost brought a motion about the cost of it and that. The only way we'd be in a position of strength to negotiate it is if we have more younger members that help to rise the age and for us old buggers so we get a good price. Because, I know for a fact, I'm 41 today and so ...I know, it's hard to believe, but for me to get that level of cover is over £30. That's the reality and you are a lot older than me, <laughs> so I hate to think what cost yours is going to be. But that's the message that we have to go back with and then try and encourage as many that aren't involved in it. And you will see we put general updates to encourage people to do it, but I really do ...I would ask as delegates to go back to your branches and try and push this, because it's a scheme when the worst happens ...there's nothing worse for us than hearing that somebody's passed away and not in it. There was another boy from Edinburgh that passed that wasn't in it and it's the difference between easing the blow. So, that's why ...so I'm going to invite Jenny up to do a draw and whoever the lucky sod is ... it's a long walk.

JENNY, GROUP LIFE: Hello. I just really wanted to thank the Association for your hospitality and inviting us to come to Conference this year and for making David and I feel so welcome. That's really to all of you as well. Your Group Life scheme is probably one of the best things that we do. It embodies the trade union spirit of caring for each other in times of trouble. We can never bring back a loved one, but the Group Life scheme can help in the immediate aftermath of a bereavement. To keep the scheme alive we do need the younger people to keep joining and I can't really endorse more than what you've said. We rely very much on the incredible work that you all do in spreading the word amongst your colleagues and friends, so thank you from the bottom of my heart for everything that you do and for the difference that you make to people's lives. We've been going for 40 years. Derek and Davey in the back there, I think you were in at the beginning. I think, it was your idea. We've had Andy Hogg, who's also been very supportive and Phil as well. Everyone within

the Union has worked so hard to make this a success, so thank you. Alan Connor.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Alan Connor, who's not here, but we'll be honest and if you can accept it on his behalf, Alan. Alright, thank you. Jenny, thank you.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Motion 71, Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: The motion reads that this association negotiates the introduction of an Independent Panel for Trawls and Assessment Panels which also includes an appeals procedure for non-selection. And it goes along with the same sort of mood from other motions. It appears more evident at the time goes on, we don't have ...I'm trying to choose my words carefully. We don't see people being promoted that are worthy of it, but we see others who maybe perhaps, others wouldn't say were worthy of the promotions. It goes along the same lines as the grievance procedures where we feel that there is no independence in the appeals process. There is no independence in Trawls or Assessment Panels, whereby we can remove certain aspects on Assessment Panel for certain grades, but keep it in for others. It seems to be one rule for one and one rule for others, so I'd urge you to support this motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Glenochil, do you wish to speak?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: I fully support this motion. There should be an appeal process. There should be and ...just as we were told earlier on when another motion failed around recruitment and promotion and all the rest of it. I speak from personal experience. I had to go through a grievance and I'm still going through a grievance purely because of the system. There should have been an appeals panel. We have operational officers, we have officers that go

for promotion and fail values-based interviews with no appeal process, based on someone making a judgement. And the wording on the panel at the end of it, doesn't actually equate to what was asked of them, because it's based on the previous set of questions that they were asked and it bears no resemblance to the promotion process that they actually went through. And you sit and you look at it and you say, 'Surely, an organisation as open and transparent as the SPS should have an open and transparent promotion process.' But we don't and we rely on a grievance process to highlight that which doesn't work out. So, I fully support this motion. Let's hope it gets passed.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Anyone else wishing to speak? Mark Meikle on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: I'm in favour of this motion you'd be glad to know, Billy. There can be an obvious inconsistency when Trawls and Assessment Panels are carried out. I personally, I've witnessed this myself when sitting on national sifts and such like, and this is most likely caused by the wide range of the backgrounds and skills of the assessors. It can be confounded when the assessor knows the applicant and has preconceived ideas of him or her themselves. It would be in the interest of our members if we had an independent panel, who dedicated and skilled in this area. It is also right and proper that they should have an appeal process. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Mark. Grampian, the right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? The motion's carried. Conference, again, we're going to take a pause from the agenda and in a minute we're going to be addressed by the Cabinet Secretary, Keith Brown. I'll just wait for him to present to the door and then I'll introduce him. Conference, I'd just like to introduce the Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans, Keith Brown. Keith, welcome.

KEITH BROWN – CABINET SECRETARY FOR JUSTICE AND VETERANS: Thanks very much and thanks

for the invitation to come along today. I'm delighted to join you at your annual conference. This is my first conference such as this as Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans, and I understand that this is your first conference since 2019 and the pandemic. So I do welcome the opportunity to engage with you all and to share some thoughts and reflections from the government's side and some comments on the work that your members provide. In particular, I would like to start by thanking you all for the valuable, indeed, invaluable work and commendable work that you do on behalf of the Scottish Government and the people of Scotland as a whole. And I say that as somebody who probably, as not being involved previously or being acutely aware of the work that you do, probably has a very one-dimensional view of what prison officers are, like based on what you see in movies and so on. But I would say in all the prisons I've visited over the last year it's obviously, very, very different. The multi-dimensional nature of the work that you do, the personal relationships that you strike up with those that you look after, it's been an education for me. And so, when I do say thank you for the work that you do, I'm, particularly, thinking about the last two years in the most trying of circumstances. I'm very grateful. And you may not know, but the Permanent Secretary of the Scottish Government, we have a new one, one of his first tasks was to go to Perth Prison. And this is a guy, a career civil servant from down south, and he said he was immediately shook by the completely different atmosphere in Perth Prison to some of the prisons that he visited down south. And he meant that in a good way. He said it was calm, it was ordered, very constructive relationships. I know that might not be the case all the time, but it certainly is something we have to hold onto.

The last couple of years as I've mentioned, of course, have been very hard. So, the pandemic has affected all of us in different ways, but those, like you, on the frontline, of course, faced particular challenges. Sometimes coming into work, day and night, regardless of what the virus transmission rates were at that time, and

of course, supporting some of the most vulnerable people in society. And of course, you also had to adjust to new ways of working, increasing restrictions and safety measures, which impacted fundamentally, both on you and those in your care. And I'm also aware, of course that some of you may have lost colleagues to COVID and I really commend the professionalism, commitment and sacrifice that you all demonstrated. And thank you for keeping the prisons safe and stable during a really difficult time. I was struck, when I went to Polmont, which I've been to a number of times since getting this job, and one of the colleagues that they have lost ... you may well know him some of you, a very keen golfer, if that gives you a more of a clue, and the way that it affected everybody else. And actually, many of the people that he looked after in Polmont as well were very affected by losing that particular colleague.

Of course, for the government putting restrictions in place was difficult. As it turned out, lifting restrictions was also very challenging. Working with public health, this required careful balancing of risks and potential harms and it wasn't just prisoners who had those risks; you had the same risks as well in many cases. And that required quite a careful balancing of skills as I say and the potential harms. And I can understand the frustration many of you must have felt, and thank you for your patience at that time.

It's worth saying, of course, that COVID is still with us and we shouldn't get too complacent about that, but the lessons that we've learned will certainly stand us in good stead in dealing with potential future pandemics. And it may only be the case that we fully understand what was done in the prisons, the benefit of the relationships which you've built up over years, in future years, when we look back at the lessons from the pandemic. That is also one of the challenges that we face. Another, of course, is the financial challenges. I'll not make any comment on what's happening at Westminster. Basically, I'll probably be out of date by the time I mention it anyway, but that is obviously

providing the backdrop to some of the circumstances which we find. And the cost-of-living crisis and pressures on the public finances are high in our minds in relation to this. As well as, of course, your members having to face these costs of living crises ...and I entirely understand the basis of pay claims which seek to reflect that, I understand that, of course, it's also true to say that if you start the year with a budget which is fixed which has inflation at 2%, that then goes to 10% and you're not able to increase taxes, nor are you able to increase borrowing, you have to find that additional money. So far, it amounts to around £700 million this year, within a year from that budget and that will be on top of a £1.7 billion cut in the budget at the start of the year. So, that obviously produces pressures. But what it doesn't take into account is that, as well as the pay pressures prisons, as you know, have to be heated, they have to be lit, they have to have food served to people, and all these prices are going up as well. So, it just shows in my view ...a bit political, but the absurdity of the fixed budget system that we have to work within. Inflation running at double digits, interest rates are rising, the cost of fuel and energy increasing and we are all feeling the pain in the public services. Don't forget, this comes after 12 years of austerity budgets. So, those pressures have built up over that time. And I'm sure there's a lot of worry and concern in the room as we face that uncertain future.

For our part, the Scottish Government, in my view, is doing everything that we can to support families, in particular, during this time. So, there's an increase to the child payment, described by poverty campaigners as a gamechanger. Including an increase to ... sorry, the further rollout of free school meals and a rent freeze and a moratorium on evictions. And the basis of that, if you remember back to 2008, was the problems that we had with the financial crash then. We felt at the time the thing to do was to guarantee people's employment. We had no money for wage increases. Nobody did, if you remember back to that time. But what we said was it's very important in Scotland to make sure that

everyone knows that their job is safe. And that was partly a selfish thing, because if people think their job is safe, they will continue spending and therefore help the recovery in the economy. But it's also to give people that social contract. But this time it's different, so that as well as trying to guarantee no compulsory redundancies, which does not have its counterpart elsewhere in the UK, we're saying to people that live in houses that might be subject to rent increases you couldn't pay, we won't allow that to happen or to be evicted. So it's trying to provide people with some reassurance, some security during this difficult time. And the fuel insecurity fund will be doubled, rail fares will be frozen until at least March and the Warmer Homes fuel poverty programme that we have will be widened even further. But there's never been a greater time of pressure on public finances and I've been doing an elected member's job now for 26 years and it always seems to be the case that we say this, but it's never been more true than it is now. And I think, whether you believe me or not, you just have to look at the TV to see what's happening, the background to this, to get some view of that. So, I've mentioned the fact that due to inflation every cost, not just pay, but every cost has increased for the government and of course, that includes the SPS. At the same time, the budget, as I say, is worth £1.7 billion less than it was worth in December. And within that context I think it's just simply a statement of fact that we're going to have to work together to get through this difficult time. And I'm aware that Teresa and her colleagues have been working hard on trying to find the resolution to the outstanding question of pay. I hear they are working non-stop now and leaving no stone unturned. But as you can imagine, this is particularly challenging in these unprecedented times. And I can't comment on the details of the work, I don't want to cut across the work that's been done on your side or with the SPS, but just to say that our watchword will be collective responsibility; how do we share our collective expertise to find a sustainable and affordable way forward through this crisis? I met with the leadership team at their request, and I understand the challenges that you and your

families are facing. We all see that being faced by society just now. I don't need to tell you as well that you're not alone in this and people from all walks of life are also facing very similar challenges. Ultimately, I think we all have to understand that we all want the same thing, which is a prosperous, safe and inclusive Scotland and a country which has well-functioning public services. And the difficulty with that ...and I'll say it again, it can't be divorced from the fact that you've had a government drive to have austerity. It started off in 2009/10 and it's been there ever since. It's never been lifted. And it's wrong-headed. It's the wrong way to try and deal with the pressures which were undoubtedly there in 2009. It limits growth, as we're now seeing. So, you now try more and more absurd ideas to try and address the issue of growth. But austerity itself limits growth and that's what you've had. And the effect of that austerity, particularly on public services over 12 years, is a large part of the explanation of where we find ourselves just now. And this is when people need those public services more than they've ever done before. And I'll just say that we should all try and not lose sight of that bigger objective, if it's possible. And I know that that comes on top of, despite those pressures over the years, a very strong partnership agreement in place between SPS and trade unions. I think this is a very positive development and approach to industrial relations in our prisons. And the value of this is evident when you look at what's been achieved in SPS over the life of the partnership agreement compared to other jurisdictions and other prison employers. I think, we do have something really special here in Scotland, both in that relationship and the relationship that that's allowed to grow between yourselves, those on the on frontline and those that you look after as well. And it may not be obvious, it might be obvious to some people, that have got experience in other jurisdictions, how special that is and how different that is, as the example I tried to give you about the Permanent Secretary's experience, what we have here in Scotland.

And we're not always very good in Scotland at recognising what we do very well, but you can't improve if you don't know, of course, what you need to do to improve where it's not where it should be, but if you don't also know what you're doing which is right and which is working and is a success. So, I think we do need to try and protect that partnership by working together constructively and understanding the respective challenges and perspectives which we have, and again, not losing sight of that bigger picture.

Just over the recent months I've had the pleasure of going to a number of establishments, Barlinnie, Edinburgh, Grampian, Dumfries, Perth and Polmont two or three times, and I've seen first-hand the valuable and sometimes very challenging work that you do. I say that, I'm not sure that I have seen that much of the challenging nature. When I tend to go and visit a prison it's extremely well-constructed, it's well-ordered and looked after, so you will have experience of much more challenging environments than it will always be when I get to go and see what happens in prisons. But meeting your colleagues I get a really good sense of the difference that you make to people every day. And I have prison officers that have told me in a prison in my own constituency, Glenochil, my own constituency, tell me that during the pandemic they felt for the first time in a number of years they were able to do things in terms of rehabilitation and the relationship with inmates that they haven't been able to before, as time and space was created to do that, because of some of the restrictions of the pandemic. And that's where we have to get to where it's not a one-dimensional thing, it's a rounded experience that you have being brought to bear in changing people lives. So, I got a good sense of that making those visits. Dumfries really impressed, especially the ability to go into that large parkland area at the side, which I know was really appreciated by people there. In fact, a young man I met at Polmont, a group of young men that were there, that got to go down on some kind of camping-type Duke of Edinburgh expeditions and they just couldn't

believe it. They just thought it was fantastic. And many people in that circumstance, you'll know better than me, have never had an experience like that, out camping in an organised way, but they thought it was fantastic. Also, I heard about some of the challenges you faced with an increasingly complex prison population. And I think about Edinburgh, it's a different ...there's serious organised groups, people that have to be protected from others and so on. Much more difficult, because they're much more sophisticated now than they have been in the past, and how we look after these different risks and problems. Illicit drug use, I'm well aware of that problem and as I've said, organised crime. I've been really impressed by the knowledge and the expertise and the professionalism that's brought to bear on the situations.

I've also had the chance recently to go to one of the new community custody units in Glasgow and I was very struck by the innovative design and the forward-thinking architecture. It's a really impressive facility. And I was speaking to your colleagues there that's highlighted to me the difference that these establishments can make, we hope they can make to women. And we use words like gender specific and trauma informed, but here your colleagues talk about how these concepts are put into practice. It really impressed me. This is a new way of doing things.

And I get attacked on a regular basis, and I'm sure papers will be the same as being all about soft justice and all the rest of it, but the simple fact is what we have to do is what works to make sure there is less crime in the future, there's less recidivism. And this to me, making sure that people when they are released from prison, have the life skills in order to sustain a proper life outside of prison. That's what's going to make them less likely to commit crime. And I'll just give you one example, if I can there, I don't know if anybody saw it, 'The most luxurious prison in the world' on TV. This was in Norway and they put Anne Widdicombe in to give her assessment of it. And it was an

incredible place. It's cost an awful lot of money, but they had a chateau or a chalet that people could go to, inmates can go to for the weekend with their families in a secure environment on the prison grounds. They had a camp that you could go to. They had their own shop that they had a budget to go and spend in, the prisoners. The recording studio they had, the sound studio, was better equipped than anything I've seen in this country anywhere. So, they put all this money into and you can see Anne Widdicombe, who you'll remember was a prisons' minister, a hardline prisons' minister, absolutely appalled by this, the way the prisoners, including people that have been convicted of murder and so on, were treated. **You can't do this.** And one of the last things that happened was she spoke to one of the prison officers and she said to him, 'So, what is the recidivism rate? What is happening here?' And he said, 'Well, what's in your country?' And she said, 'About ...' this is England, '60-80%.' And she said, 'And what is it here?' And he said, '21%.' Now, the fact that is ...apart from the fact the state will save an awful lot of money via ... or cutting by two-thirds those guilty of committing crimes again and the individuals subject to those crimes won't have to suffer, that is a massive saving to the state if you can do that in the right way. So, I do think, these community custody units, in as far as what they're trying to do is prepare women, in this case, particularly, for life after the prison is the right thing to do. But it will be attacked and it has been attacked as soft justice. But that person-centred, trauma-informed or trauma-responsive way of dealing with people is also, a key part of a broader justice strategy. It embeds the crucial collaboration, not just of the government and the SPS, but of the whole justice system and our NHS colleagues who do such important work in establishments. And that just goes to the point that most prison officers I've spoken to have told me there are people they don't think should be in prison at all; that they have different needs, whether it's addictions or whether it's a mental health issue, that being the case these people are traumatised. So, if you don't understand the trauma, it's going to make it very hard to deal

with them, in the way that it appears to me you are able to deal with them by building up that relationship. The CCUs, the Community Custody Units, in the new prison in Stirling are great examples of the success of this kind of partnership approach, but they're not alone in inventing new ways of working. The new strategy for women in custody applies to all women in your care and is setting the tone for a paradigm shift in how women are considered in the justice system. And work on the new Highland prison, the new Glasgow prison is progressing in different ways. Hampered, yes, by Brexit supply chains and increased costs, but they are progressing and they're leading the way in their construction for new innovation and inclusion. Highland will be the first net zero prison in Scotland and it will allow for more people to reside closer to their home in the community and enhance family contact. And a lot of people, certainly the ones that challenge me from the tabloid media all say, 'Why is it important that folk get to be near their families?' You will know why it's important that people are near their families. It just makes sense in terms of the job that you're trying to do. And HMP Glasgow, the new one, will provide social value that is world leading in a custodial context and positively impacts on the wellbeing of our wider community. I should also mention the important work currently under way to prepare for HMP Kilmarnock's transition to the public sector. This government strongly believes that prisons should be owned and managed by the public sector. Just as we strongly disagree with the idea that prison officers should be worked until they're aged 67, the government also believes that they should not be at the mercy of market forces and commercial interests when looking after prisoners.

HMP Kilmarnock's private sector contract is coming to an end in 2024 and your colleagues in SPS HQ are working hard to ensure a smooth transition. So, there are opportunities ahead but of course, there are also risks as I started off by saying.

And I do understand and will continue to try to understand the pressures that you continue to face in the need to manage the prison population so we don't see, for example, a return to the numbers that we saw in 2019 prior to the pandemic. Our Bail and Release from Custody Bill, which will refocus remand issues in Scotland and will also pave the way for further improvement in rehabilitation and reconviction rates.

To conclude, first of all, to say I realise I'm the last thing between you and your lunch and so I won't take much longer. And the second thing to say is we have quite an important vote in Parliament this afternoon, which I'm sure you'll see the consequences of tonight on TV, so I have to go back to Parliament after this, so apologies for not being able to stay for lunch with you. But just to conclude by again ...and I know this will probably be said at every Conference by every justice minister, but I really do want to thank you for the work that you do. It really has come home to me in a way ...I've been doing this job now for just over a year, which comes across when you go and visit the prisons to see the value of the work that's done, which by its nature is often hidden away from the general population. But I have seen it and I do appreciate it. I'm very proud of the prison service in Scotland. I was asked to do a number of TV bits yesterday and I mentioned the prison service, the police service and the fire service and I mentioned the fact that they were world leading. Now, I may be wrong in that, maybe there are other areas in the world who are doing a fantastic job, but nobody's challenged it yet. The one thing I'd say is I don't think we, including the folk that work in those services, realise how world leading that we often are. So, please be assured of the esteem in which you're held, certainly by the government. And if we can make sure and treasure the partnership that we have developed over the years as we navigate our way through the current crisis, keeping our eyes all the time on the future in which the people of Scotland can prosper and flourish. And that the SPS and your members can continue to make the massive contribution they do to the rest of

Scotland. Thank you very much and enjoy the rest of your Conference.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Cabinet Secretary, I know you're in a rush to get away for your appointments this afternoon, but I'll not take long, but just to pick up on a couple of things that you'd said. And thanks for addressing Conference for your first time, as you said. Just a couple of points, Kilmarnock coming back in, I said in my opening address to Conference that we applaud the bravery of the Scottish Government in doing that, bringing it back in, because it's another cost that has to be caught by yourselves. And the commitment you gave there about the other establishments that are coming in and remain in the public sector under the government, that's welcome to hear and I'm sure the whole of Conference are welcome to hear that. It gives that degree of certainly for us. Also, the journey that government are now taking for criminal justice is one that will eat into decades and decades of people and how they do their job and how they've always done their job. It's clear that the journey that it's going to be on is going to change. It's more person centred and we give you the commitment from the top table that we'll work with the employer in bringing those things and we identify that it's going to be needed. And as I say, we give the commitment that we will be part of the journey to reach the goal that the government is setting for us to be involved in. You also touched on the establishments that you've attended. I know that it's well received. I'm also delighted that you said they're well-choreographed, because the ground gets an extra sweep when we know we have a visitor coming in and it's good that you identify that the reality is somewhat different from what you have. It would be remiss of me not to say that Shotts mentioned to me last night they're looking forward to having you in. I don't want to miss the opportunity of saying that, because John will nip my ear later on. But as I say, the attendance that you're doing, I know it's well received and we look forward to you getting around more of

the establishments on that. And the finances that you touched on, it's not lost. Our Chief Executive, Teresa, mentioned it as well, we're well aware of it. And just to be upfront and honest with everyone, it will not stop us in our drive and our determination to get the best deal possible for our membership on pay. Because the reality is, as is government, our membership are struggling to heat and feed. So, just to get that point across, but I'll not hold you up much longer. Thank you for attending and thank you for addressing Conference. I've just got a small token to give you for our appreciation. It's not flowers, Teresa.

<Laughter>

Yeah, thanks a lot.

KEITH BROWN – CABINET SECRETARY FOR JUSTICE AND VETERANS: I appreciate it. Thank you.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Conference, lunch isn't until 1:15 in the dining hall ...or dining room, sorry, dining hall, back at school. But we'll finish up for now and if you can be back for 2:35. OK, thank you.

TAYAV007 starts:

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Hi, Conference, welcome back. Just before we move on with the agenda, I'd just ask Jim McCabe, who's the Chair of the Standing Orders Committee, to make an announcement.

JIM MCCABE – SNC VICE CHAIR: We received an emergency motion over lunch from the Shotts branch. The Standing Orders Committee have met and it'll be placed after the last motions heard today. This motion will also be heard in camera.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Jim. So, what the plan is to do is we're just going to walk through to up to motion 84 and then going to do the Chairman's address for Conference. And we'll ask everybody to leave

apart from the delegates and as I say, we'll then have the motion. The motion will be distributed at that time and we'll hear the motion in camera after that. OK. Thank you. Motion 72, Dumfries. OK, do we have a seconder? Shotts. Shotts, do you wish to speak?

[1:30]

<Laughter>

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: Chair, Conference ... <Laughs> I know. I fully support this motion, colleagues. This ties in with how many females we're actually getting in establishments at this moment in time. And what we've got there now, is at front of house, for example, we're sticking to the rules, so females cannot wand down the males and females cannot rub down prisoners on the setting. But what's actually been happening is we have got four lassies at the front of the house and all they can do is search females. So, there's a security issue at that point in time, because people can come in who are being compromised, perhaps and we've got people who are working in the health centre, education, that are females that are coming down onto the landing. And when they're coming down onto the landing there's another three females that they're coming down to. So, what we're actually having at that point in time is there's nobody rubbing down the prisoner when they're going and walking about, unless we call somebody else up who's male to try and get a grip of that, which is not always happening. So, I believe in England, they've actually got this in place where the females can actually, rubdown. And it quite clearly states that, we're not going into a full body search. So, a rubdown, collar, open your mouth, that type of stuff, I don't see why it's an issue any longer. And I think it's something that really does have to be looked at and changed under the prison rules. Please support.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts. Low Moss.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: A bit

controversial, I'm going to ask you to consider rejecting the motion. I think the law, the way it stands just now, offers more protection for our members. I think if we move out of that and we open it up we're, certainly, leaving our members more vulnerable, because remember this works both ways. This isn't just about female staff and male prisoners. It works the opposite way as well. We've got male staff and female prisoners. Certainly, the male ... certainly, I know it's controversial, but I don't want to be putting my hands on a female at all and being placed in that position. And I'm sure I speak for many males. I think, we all see the problem here. The problem is in I think sensitive and competent recruitment, rather than trying to change the law to accommodate what we've got just now. And that's something that as a union we should be discussing with the employer. Because, we've talked today and yesterday about the ratio of male/female staff in prisons. I think, someone quoted even 50/50 yesterday, which does ... it is beginning to tip the balance and I think that conversation needs to be had pretty soon. So, I ask you to consider rejecting that motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Low Moss. Greenock?

DON MCGRORY – BRANCH DELEGATE, GREENOCK: I'm asking you to reject the motion. Honestly, as previously said, I understand what's behind the motion with the amount of female staff that we now have working in male establishments, but this isn't the answer. And I know John was saying about the English service, that's started 30 years ago in the English service. So, I've seen first-hand what it was like for female staff rubbing down male prisoners and I certainly wouldn't want it for male members rubbing down female prisoners, because we all know some female prisoners are very fond of making up allegations, so I wouldn't want male members of staff being involved in stuff like that. And it's needless, because we've already got a solution and management have accepted it, because it's management that brought it in in the form of GORs, Genuine Operational

Requirements. So, in Greenock we've got one female hall. 70% of the staff rostered in that hall must be females. When you're talking front of house, certain percent of the staff that worked in front of house must be females, so there are females to search female prisoners. So, the argument is already won. It's an open goal. So, see if you're getting problems in certain halls or certain areas in your establishments where you cannot do your business, go to your manager and say you want a GOR put in and see if they're not going to do it, put in an affiliate [06:19], it's as simple as that. And the affiliate [06:22] will then go to the top table and then I believe it'll be ...it'll have national implications, because it'll not be just in whatever area you're wanting that affiliate [06:31] in, they'll have to say, 'Right, from now on ...' to me, you'll end up with GORs in every operational establishment, every operational areas in an establishment. Because, when it gets to national level, it will have national implications and to me we cannot lose, because management is the one that's argued for it. And you cannot say, 'Well, we can only have it dealing with female prisoners.' For obvious reasons obviously, you cannot say that. So, the argument is already won. So, my advice is, if you've got an area where you cannot run your jail, see your management, because they're the ones to deal with it, put in an affiliate [07:06] and then see what happens when it goes to the top table. Please reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Greenock. Anybody else? No. Mark Meikle on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Mark Meikle speaking against this motion. I thought maybe somebody would have mentioned it, but we've certain well held arguments that this happens in airports, so why not in prisons. I believe there's a clear difference to me. Because of the nature of the individuals we are dealing with, who are less likely to be conformant when being rubbed down by an officer of a different gender, either it would be obstructive or indeed, just for high jinks. There's also the worry of accusations being made by either gender being rubbed

down by another, which could lead to investigations as alluded already by Don. Particularly, with prisoners who have issues, which are quite often trauma based, as alluded to by Malky. And indeed, staff who have issues, which may well be trauma based. I do not believe we should be asking any of our members to carry out duties that they're uncomfortable with and being left open to allegations. With the SNC I've been at several meetings about cross-gender searching, which has come to the fore before this has. And our focus has been on introducing the use of technology. The introduction of body scanners have been our ultimate aim to negate the need of hands-on security searching where it's necessary. This would be a far more suitable outcome for places like Dumfries that have a genuine problem. Put in the investment, put in the appropriate body scanners, use the appropriate technology and that will negate any need for people having to do stuff they're uncomfortable with. Please reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Mark. All those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion's lost. Motion 73, Edinburgh?

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH DELEGATE, EDINBURGH: The motion reads, 'With the price of fuel/living costs rising that the lateral transfer process be revisited/open-ended, giving staff an option of working closer to home.' Now, I know that the transfer's open now, but we feel it should be open all the time. There's members travelling from Glasgow, Perth, Dundee to work in Edinburgh and we feel that the cost of fuel is affecting them for their travelling lives. So please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Edinburgh. Can I have a seconder for the motion? Glenochil, do you wish to speak?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: I fully support this motion by the reason that we have been speaking and in dialogue with our HRDP for, what, two or three years and she actually, endorsed it. She

actually, said, 'Yes, you're right it should be open.' We actually, had a situation where we had a lad at Airdale, who was granted a lateral transfer and set its start for seven months, because we need the action that could be said, 'Oh, we've not got the window open yet. You'll need to wait 'til the window opens.' He eventually went to Barlinnie on a compassionate transfer based on medical, because the laterals were not getting actions. Now, I know that the window's open at the moment and they say it's open until ...well, I think, it was last week or whatever it is and they'll action it in February. No, not good enough. We should have that open, that process sits there. If you put in for a lateral transfer to Shotts, Greenock or where else, it sits on your card. It's in your HR file. They can come and revisit you any time and say, 'Are you still wanting that transfer?' 'Yeah, I would, thanks very much.' 'Off you go.' Obviously, within the caveats that we have as we release staff that get jobs within eight weeks or X amount or whatever it is. Funnily enough, it seems to take a very long time for them to move staff. But if you're higher up the food chain you can move within 24 hours. So, please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Greenock?

DON MCGRORY – BRANCH DELEGATE, GREENOCK: I'm actually going to support a motion here. Why is lateral transfers not always open? Like a promotion process, why is it's so complicated and time consuming? It's almost like it's to justify people's existence somewhere, wherever it is these people sit. Going back to when I worked in the English service, see if you wanted to transfer, you wrote to the [12:34 GOU] to transfer [12:35] and you get put on a waiting list. And see when a job came up, they phoned you up and said, 'Do you want a job? No bother.' How hard's that? How hard's that? Do you know what I mean? Why have got this convoluted process just to transfer jails? Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Greenock. Anyone else wishing to speak? Karen Ewen, on behalf of the SNC.

KAREN EWEN – SNC: Conference, we're happy to support this motion. As it's already been said, the window is now open and you're right it closes on 31st of January. The impact of this motion to try and keep this window open to help our members is important. It can be life changing for some people. So, therefore, we do support the motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Karen. Edinburgh, the right to reply? All those in favour for the motion? The motion's carried. Motion 74, Grampian.

KENNY CAMPBELL – BRANCH SECRETARY, GRAMPIAN: The motion reads as a matter of health and safety, the association seek the return of the Boot and Shoe allowance for Operational staff similar to that available to PTI's, Catering staff, Industries and Estates. A lot of staff now are choosing their own footwear to come into work. A lot of them are coming in in training shoes, sometimes they look like slippers on occasion. Picked for comfort not for durability. Senior management has come to us and asked us are we happy with the standard of footwear. Now, if I'm paying for my footwear, I'm more than happy to come in in whatever I want. If senior management want us to wear a certain type of footwear, let them pay for the privilege. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Do I have seconder for the motion? Castle Huntly, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wish to speak? Willie Carle on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: Conference, we cannot support this motion as it is written as asking for an allowance for staff. As such, the motion cannot be taken through health and safety. If it was to ask for shoes and boots to be supplied, we'd have more of a chance. But the wording states allowance, so it falls at the first fence and is unachievable. Conference, if safety

boots or shoes are needed, risk assess the area, the work involved and get management to supply them. You won't get an allowance through health and safety. Therefore, we ask you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Willie. Grampian, the right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion's lost. Motion 75, Grampian.

KENNY CAMPBELL – BRANCH SECRETARY, GRAMPIAN: The motion reads, that this association negotiates with management a proper definition of 'Operational Requirement' and 'Operational Emergency'. This comes from the problem we're now facing, late transfers, late admissions to courts, staff having to work past their finishing time and being told by first line managers senior managers that, no, they can't go home, they have to stay in. So, if they have to stay in it's an operational emergency an exigency. The choice then should be for them whether they get TOIL or ex-gratia. They shouldn't be made to stay past their hours, because our partners, be it GOA and the NHS cannot get prisoners to us in time. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Do we have a seconder? Perth, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wanting to speak? John McCabe, on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN MCCABE – SNC VICE CHAIR: Speaking on behalf of the SNC, has asked me to support the motion, to get the proper definition of operational requirement and operation emergency. So, the operational requirement is for people to turn up at start time and finishing time and you'll work in between. At the end of that shift you're entitled to go home. If a manager on a regular basis is saying they need you to stay because a transfers coming in or coming out, that's falling under the foreseeability. If it's happening on a regular basis, you can put in place systems to address that. Barlinnie has a late, late system to deal with courts, so we can put that in. However, nobody can be ordered to stay behind and if a

manager is saying it's an emergency, that presents a significant risk to the [18:39] of basic standards of custody, you're entitled to the exigency payment. Not necessarily TOIL or overtime, there's a payment there if he's calling that. So, just be aware about that. However, we are supporting the motion. Thanks.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, John. Grampian, would you like to reply? All those in favour? The motion's carried. Motion 76, Barlinnie.

MICK MULHOLLAND – BRANCH CHAIR, BARLINNIE: Motion 76 reads, Conference mandate the SNC to engage with the employer to make provisions for a regular counselling service to support officers who work with Sex Offenders. Officers are at times dealing with high-level offence details, which can have a detrimental effect on an Individual's mental health. By providing such a service, the employer would be evidencing compliance with their legislative duties.

So, just for clarity, the new programme moving forward to change is a pilot programme, which has counselling factored into the actual facility. However, the issue is that not all staff that are involved in delivering this programme have that facility built into their roster and we think it should. And I ask Conference to back this motion to protect our members from the trauma of being exposed to such horrific information.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Barlinnie. Do I have a seconder for the motion? Glenochil, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Karen Ewen, on behalf of the SNC.

KAREN EWEN – SNC: Conference, we welcome any form of support that can be given over and above what is currently offered by our employer. We are more than happy to have the opportunity to engage with the employer and explore any further avenues that may be available to our members, so please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Karen. Barlinnie, would you like to reply? OK. All those in favour? The motion's carried. Motion 77, an SNC motion and moving the motion, John Devine.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Motion 77 reads that this conference recognises that our Employer has the authority to make the provision for the use of work equipment. Conference also recognises that before the employer introduces any new equipment for use in the workplace, the employer should ensure that the equipment is necessary and fit for purpose. There should also be a robust business case in order to justify the purpose of that equipment. Conference, under the Provision and Use of Work Equipment Regulations 1998, if an organisation intends to use or provide any work equipment then the organisation has got a number of duties that's placed on them. The first, they need to ensure that the equipment is suitable for the purpose it is used or provided for. They must ensure that the work equipment is necessary. They must ensure that the equipment is only used for the suitable purposes and they should also, ensure that work equipment is maintained in an efficient state and efficient working order and in good repair. This is not an exhaustive list. There is also, other duties withing that regulation placed on the employer. In the current financial climate it's absolutely essential that we ensure that these regulations are followed. This may go some way to alleviating any concerns that we may have by the introduction of work equipment that is unnecessary or unjustified. Who knows it may be unnecessary at this moment in time to introduce body cameras, solely on the issue of cost. So, that's just something for us to remember. Conference, we're asking you to support the motion and what it recognises.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, John. Do we have a seconder for the motion? Castle Huntley, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? All those in favour? The motion's carried. Thank you. Motion 78, also

an SNC motion and again, John Devine, moving the motion on behalf of the SNC.

JOHN DEVINE – SNC: Thanks, Chair. Motion 78 reads that this Conference supports the fact that our employer has the authority and duty to provide such suitable PPE to protect employees from any new or emerging hazards. Conference also acknowledges that our employer should carry out a suitable and sufficient risk assessment to determine these Hazards and either eliminate them or control them. Conference, this motion speaks for itself. The employer's duties are set out clearly within the relevant PPE regulations, which are also enabled by the Health and Safety at Work Act of 1974. There have been occasions where some members have questioned their employer's authority and duty. An example was the introduction of face masks during the pandemic. Our members should not be adverse to accepting their employer's authority and duty. When an employer makes provision for the use of PPE for the safety of their members, it is the employee's duty also, to use that equipment. The SNC are asking you to support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, John. Do I have a seconder for the motion? Glenochil, do you wish to speak? Anyone want to speak? All those in favour of the motion? The motion's carried. Motion 79, Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: The motion reads that Conference request that the SNC seek to negotiate that the calculators used for staffing levels are altered to show the higher prisoner numbers that are now normal at various prisons. Conference request that the SNC stipulate a review date to look at the staffing levels. I actually had to go back to the member on this one and ask for a wee bit of clarification on what they actually, meant and I don't necessarily say that the wording on the motion is actually, as accurate as it could have been for him. And that's maybe something that we missed at the time. But it's to do with the fact that since ...back in the mists of time again, that

we've had additional numbers in prisons and they say there's ex-gratia to pay for it. Well, what you cover that for this and then use a calculator to reduce the amount of cover that you're actually, going to get, because it's paid out of 1.3 and 1.6. So, you don't get your full cover. You can only get part of your cover. Sorry, we still need one person there, not a part of a person is going in to do that shift. It's a full person. But what is doesn't take into account ...and this is what the actual member meant by it, it doesn't take into account everything else that the prison service has got to do. It doesn't take into account the fact that we're feeding their prisoners. That we've got to put them to work. We've got to put them for social workers, so we've got to do this, we've got to do that. Seemingly, it just only counts where we house them, because that's where they stay. But actually, if you look at it since whenever it was, 2003 or 2002 when all these extra, 'We'll pay it for three months, it's alright it's just to get us through a hump.' Well, we've been doing it since then. So, it's about time we actually sit down with our employer and say, 'Look a minute, you have had it good for long enough. Meaning you actually, start looking at what you're expecting us to do, what resources you're giving us.' And I get it everything's tight. But they maybe want to reduce what they're doing or maybe actually, start changing how we look after them. But what we cannot keep doing is keep saying, 'Aye, there's ex-gratia,' which isn't getting picked up. I don't know how many establishments out there get a food coverage in their ex-gratia and a full staffing level. It ain't happening. So, after getting that clarification that's what we have, so please support the motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Do I have a seconder for the motion? Low Moss, do you wish to speak?

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: I just want to reiterate what Billy said there. I know there is focus on prison population and that, but I don't think we can ignore the fact of the complexity of what we're dealing with in terms of what we

have got to offer prisoners now and the variety of prisoners we've got now with regards to protections. Protection from protections. We've certainly got more older prisoners in there. These all require extra resources that we're not being compensated for just now, so please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Low Moss. Anyone else wishing to speak? No. Willie Carle, on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: Conference, we're asking you to reject the motion. We understand the sentiments of where the motion is coming from, but the wording of the motion states using prison numbers that can go up and down to agree a complement of staffing levels. On what could be a temporary increase to prisoner numbers could put our members at risk. As it stands, prison numbers are predicted to fall and we're already 800 prisoners down in pre-COVID levels. The question is what happens when the prisoner numbers go down? How can we justify keeping extra staff, if we've just argued that we need more staff for more prisoners. The SPS could just reverse the argument and win on a precedent set. We could end up with worsening staffing issues, where staff won't work in certain establishments due to the fear of a drop of prison numbers, leading to staff level issues that will never be fixed. There is a risk at this time if this motion is passed. Just look at the establishments that have reduced prison numbers like, Polmont, Grampian and Castle. I guarantee on the current claim that management are looking for savings and/or transfers a detriment to our members. And we could not have an argument as we can't have our cake and eat it. Conference, this motion could result in job losses and destruction to our members, as such, we're asking you to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Willie. Glenochil, the right to reply?

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: I get it, I understand it. I know, that's why I went back to the member myself to seek a bit more clarification and you're correct

we may be missed a trick with the wording. But we cannot ignore it. We cannot sit back and just turn and say, 'Do you know what, well if the numbers go down, we'll reduce the numbers.' I'll tell you that the prison ...we've got a situation right now where the ratios ...there's no such thing as a recognised ratio for x, y or z. They could open a wing up or a hall up or whatever else and we've got it down to there's four on the landing, additional numbers that's an extra one, additional numbers an extra this. And if you work in this shed it's this number or that number. That fluctuates all the time. That fluctuates. The management at any point could turn around and say, 'Oh, do you know what? We'll shut that, we'll get rid of you.' That's where we come in as the union, the SNC and we say, 'Do you what? No, you're not going to do that. Because see when we reduce our numbers that gives us no time to engage with prisoners, go and talk to them, sit down.' Not rush about trying to say, 'Do you know what? I need to squeeze that into my working day, because I've got another 25 to get ready.' We should be working the numbers. We should be sitting down right now as a prison officer, sitting down with potentially ten, five, six folk that we're working with on a regular basis to engage with them. To get them through their sense to get that thing out, not 40, not [32:00] whatever it is. We need to sit down and get the motion and get the understanding of it. But we need to sit down and start saying, 'Do you know what? You cannot keep giving us this carrot that says, "Here's the ex-gratia. Get on with it. Keep doing that."' So, support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. All those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion's lost. Motion 80, Inverness.

ROBERT LEES – BRANCH CHAIR, INVERNESS: Chair, Conference, colleagues, the motion reads Conference mandate the SNC to seek a change to polo shirts from uniform shirts. Ladies and gentlemen, the motion from the members at HMP Inverness is to mandate the SNC to call for a change to polo shirts from uniform shirts. This year in Inverness we

experienced very warm temperatures of nearly nine degrees on some days. Staff supervising exercise on these days found the uniform shirts hot and sticky and left them tired when trying to do their job to the best of their ability. To alleviate this issue, I move that members be issued with high performance working polo shirts for summer use to keep them dry and comfortable. The high-performance wicking materials helps regulate body temperatures keeping staff cool on hot days and they shouldn't lose body heat when they are cold. Police forces are now wearing a smart ...working polo shirts with epaulettes and I think, it's time now that the Scottish Prison Service followed suit and introduced the appropriate working polo shirts with epaulettes. Please support the motion. Thank you very much.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Inverness. Do we have a seconder for the motion. No seconder, the motion falls. Motion 81, Dumfries. Do we have a seconder?

<Laughter>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: No seconder, the motion falls. Motion 82, Grampian.

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: The motion reads, The POA seek the SPS the re-introduction of a form of points for yearly uniform, to enable staff to request uniform that they need, instead of what SPS determines they should have. So, what we're looking at here is currently just now, all operational officers are provided with a pre-determined limit on what we can order. Uniform is part of our terms and conditions, we pay for that in our wages. If I remember correctly, the pre-determined limit for a big year is one jacket, outside over trousers, formal trousers, cargos, one jumper, soft shell jacket, a hat, gloves and epaulettes. So what we're looking at is that this amount of uniform that's coming to an individual that we're storing in our house that we don't need, we haven't asked for that pre-determined amount of kit. It also provides security risks, whereby uniforms lying

about our establishments all over the place where anybody can access that. The destruction of uniform, I'm not sure how it works in every establishment, how it's supposed to work and how it worked in the past was that you handed your uniform back into central ...or back into your stores and they would dispose of it. But they don't take it from you now. Your uniforms given to you in that big box and whether you like it or not, you're taking it and how you dispose of it is up to you or it seems to be that. I would urge you to support this motion. Thank you.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Do I have a seconder for the motion? Greenock, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? William Reid on behalf of the SNC.

WILLIAM REID – FINANCE OFFICER, SNC: Conference, we actually support this motion. Conference, there really is a simple, cost-efficient and eco-friendly solution to the problem raised with the delayed issuing of uniform. Yes, you've heard the argument you should only order what you need, unfortunately, that argument does not hold water when we cannot guarantee when we will get our own order. The fact is the point system worked and we haven't heard a valid reason either previously or now for it not to be reinstated. Conference, we support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Willie. All those in favour of the motion? The motion's carried. Motion 83, Grampian.

KENNY CAMPBELL – BRANCH SECRETARY, GRAMPIAN: The motion reads that conference mandate the SNC to engage with the SPS to seek the introduction of a modern and functional uniform to be presented to operational staff. We all know the issues with the uniform. It's quality, it's supply, it's getting it and it's just not suitable for modern prison officers. We're doing a variety of different things now. It's somewhere between formal and informal. It's not fit for purpose. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Do I have a seconder for the motion? Dumfries, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: I'd go as far as to actually say to add for an extra. We don't have a formal uniform. We don't have a formal dress uniform. The English service still does. We don't. And we recently lost two members of staff in service where we had to do a formal ...as a matter of fact actually, they're going to have one in a week's time where they've asked for formal dress. We don't have it. We have a pair of black trousers, cargo trousers, or a zip-up waterproof jacket that isn't waterproof. So, I'd go even further to say the uniform itself hasn't actually, allowed us as a service to actually, be able to go and do things as a uniformed service to actually look smart when you go and have to do ceremonial stuff for our members for things that we should be able to do. And the uniform itself, it needs to be fit for purpose for the cold weather, the hot weather, the whole shooting match. It isn't. It's done on the cheap, it's kept on the cheap, so that's it. So, we actually, need better uniform for our members and we certainly need a dress uniform for our members. I'm not saying we go back to the old one which was made in a sweat shop. So, thanks very much and support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Anyone else wishing to speak? For the last time, although he's not retiring yet, but yeah, this is for the last time representing the SNC on a response, we've Willie Carle.

<Laughter>

WILLIE CARLE – SNC: We're asking you to reject the motion and the reason is we've not had any complaints at all about changing the uniform. No one's came to us about changing the uniform. About the quality of the uniform, yes, but any issues regarding the quality of the uniform can be addressed through the Uniform Committee and it can be sorted there. And considering the time taken and the issues with getting to an agreement on the current uniform,

we believe we should leave well along, as if it's not broke don't fix it. As such, we don't believe this motion is needed at this time and ask Conference to reject the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Willie. Grampian, the right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? All those against? Any abstentions? It's a tie.

<Laughter>

The motion's carried. The motion's carried. Motion 84, Edinburgh.

GRANT FORRESTER – BRANCH DELEGATE, EDINBURGH: Grant Forrester, for the last time. The SNC instruct the SPS that if name badges are worn then it will be down to the individual member of staff to decide as to the name format. This is quite straightforward if a member wants to have their full name on the badge, let them have it. If they don't want that, don't have it. Please support this motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Edinburgh. Do I have a seconder for the motion? No ...oh, sorry, somebody's ...Low Moss ...sorry, Cornton Vale, do you wish to speak? Anyone else wishing to speak? Mark Meikle, on behalf of the SNC.

MARK MEIKLE – SNC: Speaking on behalf of the SNC, in favour of this motion. We believe that this is actually, already the agreed position as it's never changed since they were first introduced. When name badges were introduced, you'll remember it came with a letter and then your name. Some people chose to have their full name on it and some didn't. But the policy was that's the way they were done. There is, however, some establishments that have come to light recently that are insisting that first names are put on the name badges and it's to meet with the corporate image that some governors want. Most members don't really care about this and I know it's the last motion of the day, but there are, however, some who prefer for prisoners, or more often visitors not to know their full name.

It came to light from Edinburgh I was aware of a case where there was a female working in the front of house and it was insisting that she had her full name and she was then stalked on Facebook. And she believed it was made easier, because her full name helped them access it a bit quicker. If individuals want to have an initial ...if I want to be known as M. Meikle or Mark Meikle, that should be my decision and my right. And it's also the right for individuals to be known as what they wish. Please support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Mark. Edinburgh, the right to reply? All those in favour of the motion? All those against? The motion's carried. Conference, that brings an end to the agenda and the booklets. As I said at the start of this session, we'll do a kind of a sum-up to thank everyone for being here and then we'll move onto the in-camera debate on the emergency motion that got handed out before the session starts. So, for myself, bringing to this Conference, the first one obviously, as Chair, daunting, but enjoyable. I just want to thank you for the professional manner in where it was had, both in here and also, at the night. I hope it continues tonight and I don't rue those words tomorrow morning. During Conference we were addressed by both the Chief Executive and the Cab Sec. Both laid bare reality of this financial crisis' meaning to the organisation and as an SNC we will work closely with the organisation to ensure that the savings that the organisation have to make don't negatively impact our members. We have to be realistic, you heard it, but we'll do whatever we can to make sure the impact's minimal for our membership. The motions that were passed today shape our future going forward for the next year or so. They may deliver on what was passed. We give you our word that we will give it our best shot and you will get reports back next year on what we've achieved and how we've achieved it and throughout the year, hopefully. I'd like to place on record my thanks to those who participate in the motions. It was a lot quieter than usual, but when I'm looking at the top table it's clear to see why, because half the mouthpieces are up

here now. But to those that did participate, thanks very much. For those that didn't, I hope the experience of it maybe gives confidence next year to get more involved with it. But thanks to those that participated. And all our life members and invited guests, thank you for your attention and your attendance that you gave Conference. It's remarkable to see how you continue to sit through your Conference, so it's great. And I look forward to seeing you all back next year. I'll just thank the SNC for the hard work done in preparing the motion responses. I know it may seem that there's not a lot of work goes in, but I know a lot of work goes in. So, doing that on top of their already existing workloads is appreciated. So, thanks very much to you all. For me, I'm going to single out Phil Fairlie for the support he gave me. I don't know if you've seen it through Conference, his ear must be red raw. So, I appreciate the support and guidance that he's game me through this, so thanks for that, Phil. And also a massive thanks to Kathryn. As you know, it's usually Kathryn plus one, but it's Kathryn flying solo. To bring all this together, to do everything that this takes to prepare, it doesn't happen itself. That, added with 1,000 membership change of details and to try and prepare for the ballot on strike. That, with Carstairs, the work that got done before and three or four pay offers that you've had to prepare the ballot papers for and get them distributed. So, thanks very much for that. And as custom, I'll just take this opportunity just to present you with a token of thanks.

KATHRYN FAIRLIE: Ah, thank you very much.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: And final thanks go to the four, arguably, busiest people ... and I hope you have got Fitbits on because the amount of walking about the stewards did through here is ...again, it helps to keep the Conference balanced. So, Willie, Gary, Paul and Rab ...I was going to call you Tam there, Rab, thanks very much for the effort you've put in, guys.

<Applause>

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: And just to end again and thank everyone for their participation over the last couple of days and as I say, I look to seeing as many of you back next year, so thanks very much.

<Applause>

We'll convene in five minutes just to give you the opportunity to get the emergency motion out. And as I say, just the delegates in the room. Thank you. I assume you have all got the emergency motion, yeah. So I invite Shotts branch up to move the emergency motion.

JOHN DICKSON – BRANCH CHAIR, SHOTTS: The emergency motion reads, after yesterday's announcement by government and the Chief Executive and Cabinet Secretary's addresses today, we ask for an in-chair, in-camera debate on the impact of the financial implications on the struggles ahead and the ongoing pay negotiations. I was mandated at my local meeting to listen to everything that's going to get said today with the Chief and with the Justice Minister on anything at all to do with pay. So, what I picked up on was yesterday's budget review, costs of all public services up. A 2% budget given at the beginning of the year with the CPI sitting at 5%. It's now 10%. £1.7 billion less than it was in December and the total budget that the Scottish Government's got is fixed. He stated yesterday, Mr Swinney, that no legal right to borrow on pay, absolute limits reached on spending. He pointed out the police and ScotRail have accepted 5% and enhanced payments have cost £700 million as it stands right now. He's got no unallocated cash, no reserve and that £500 million that he'd actually, put down to spend has now been moved sideways to come back in to try and balance the books. I then picked up what seemed to be a current theme, because Teresa was at the top there as well, she was saying inflation impacting on the cost of living. They're striving to achieve a deal up to the top table, restricted finances and budget deficits, costs up, fuel, lighting, food in their prisons meaning there's less money there for us. And the justice sector

is identifying measures to cut back. We have got 24/7 usage and we still keep delivering. We've got resource challenges, money's tight, payroll services are coming into place to try and alleviate some of the concerns we've got for the way things are happening and pressure on finances. And then we had the Cabinet Sec, a very good speech I thought he actually, gave. But he was also saying that we're still sticking with the no compulsory redundancies, still looking for job security and then he pointed out the £1.7 billion less and the challenging financial crisis. So, what I'm actually, up here to do is to say, what can we do to help the SNC at this point in time? What is realistic that we're looking for, for the pay deal? Because as it stands right now, it's 10% that they're asking us to go in the car park for. But is that a realistic figure as it stands right now, where we actually are? Because what are willing to stand out in that car park for and for how long are we going to have to do it? And I think, we need to get a debate on this to say where all the branches are. Because as you are aware, my branch voted to accept the pay offer and that's why I've had to stand up here and say this today. So, I would like you all to debate this on where we actually stand and give these guys a clearer steer on where we should be going next. Please support the debate.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Shotts. Anyone want to join the debate? Low Moss. If you want to come up, there's a couple of seats there as well, if you want to head up.

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Yeah, I'll make it really simple, we've ...front of house conducted the ballot, etc., we were asking people, 'What's your figure?' And 7% that's what came back. Pretty confident on 7%. I've nothing more to add on that.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Just on that, I just think, to be cautious that we're not really looking for people to throw figures at us to what it is. So, we don't really like to turn this into what we would think is a pay negotiation.

So, it's just really the body, the motion. Do you want to come back on that, Malky?

MALKY MCKAY – BRANCH SECRETARY, LOW MOSS: Yeah, I that, John. It was just ...it wasn't to influence you or anything like that, it's just so you know. Because another branch might have a query with us. There's branches that have voted to accept this, so it was just to give you an indication, so you've got an all-round, balanced view of what's happening.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Grampian?

CHRIS BAIN – BRANCH CHAIR, GRAMPIAN: So, pay negotiations started at 2%. They then increased to 5%. Now we've heard all the information from everybody saying that money's tight. Westminster always say money's tight, but there's always money for other things that they want to do. I think, what we're hearing is yes, a legitimate claim that everything is costing more. Electricity costs more, but it costs more at home too. It costs more to travel to work too. Everything costs more. So, they've started off at 2%, they moved to 5%, I think, we should be pushing for more just as everybody else has. I wouldn't put a figure on it, but I would urge you to support the motion.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Grampian. Glenochil.

BILLY YOUNG – BRANCH CHAIR, GLENOCHIL: It was alluded they always find money. I'm not going to talk about that woman that went into Westminster ...well, actually I will, there you go. She went in and wiped whatever it is, £300 billion off of shares and stocks and then it recoups and then it goes back. The SPS, yes, has a tight budget themselves, but look at the numbers on their stats, the gaps in the pay. Well, the gaps in actually, covering staffing and that's been running for years and these all these things they keep saying, 'Ah, but we're running to a budget. There's no more money.' Where does it go? It goes back to the government. So, we

get government money handed to us, then they sit down and ringfence X amount for this and X amount for that, knowing full well we're not going to use it. And they hand it back to the government. So, what we need to turn and say to the government is, 'Stop playing piggybank with the SPS. Actually, put down and say, "This is what we can deliver, here's what we expect to go forward and here's a balanced way that we're happy with going forward and your staff will confirm it."' I never joined the SPS to think I was going to get stratospheric wages. I'd have went and done private sector work when I left the forces if I wanted to go and get that kind of money for all the things that come with it. But you take on board what you take and you say, 'Right, a fair day's wage, a fair day's pay' and your pension comes at the back of that. That's how it should be and that's what these guys hopefully will sit down and say. I'm not accepting 10%, I'll be fair. That's not that. Meet in the middle. Get a balance and say, 'Right, OK, we're all taking a hit. I get the fact we all want more money, but we'll take a hit. You take that hit too.' And we'll deliver going forward, these guys will deliver going forward and hopefully we can get to the end of this disaster or a country that we're running that we're running now, because the folk in charge couldn't give a monkey's about us. It's all about their own wee pals and their own wee networking and siphoning money off. They found all that money during COVID to cover everything. I'm pretty sure they can find a few more shekels for the poor workers like us. So, join the debate.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Glenochil. Polmont.

EDDIE CRUSE – BRANCH DELEGATE, POLMONT: Chair, Conference, I can see the essence of this motion that Shotts have brought and I'm still struggling in some respect, because we've got a branch that has been ...like everybody else's, been very well debated. Johnny and myself, one was a yes and one was a no and for the right reasons, I think and we respect everybody who would have voted yes. And I think what we're getting here, is where

are we right now and what is our expectations for it, or our branch's expectations for its prison officers to be paid a fair wage? 10% isn't an aspiration. 10% is an economic reality as to where we should be and that is what we need to try to achieve. I'm not saying we're going to achieve 10%, but I think, we also need to be very, very mindful where we are with Scottish Government budgets and how much ...and I most certainly support the SNC on this occasion and I think we have to be mindful just how difficult that is going to be. And going back to your branches and saying to your branches you did expect more, but at these particular times, whatever it is comes in this meeting or the meetings next week, I don't see it being much ...I think this is an interesting debate and an interesting time, most certainly. And we have got a difficult few weeks ahead perhaps, but everybody is now looking to strike action and they're saying strike action over three days, my pay, my pension. We have people telling us, 'If I could vote again, I'd vote yes.' But there's still some people out there who, isn't there something more we will consolidate prison officers' anger and they will take it to the car park. And I don't think that's what anybody wants. Nobody could ever want that. An interesting debate, John, an interesting time. I appreciate you having brought it and we have got a difficult couple of weeks ahead, but I think, we should support the SNC on this. Please join the debate.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Polmont. Greenock.

DON MCGRORY – BRANCH DELEGATE, GREENOCK: I don't really see the point of this debate. We had a national ballot and 70% voted to reject the latest pay award. And we were told if we reject it, then we're balloted for strike action. So, bang on.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Greenock. Anyone else wishing to participate in the debate? No. On behalf of the SNC, Jim McCabe.

JIM MCCABE – SNC VICE CHAIR: I'd like to thank Shotts for bringing it. A couple of

things you said there, John ...I'm actually going to flick back and forth here, because I'm trying to get things in my mind, you were talking about what was released was the police got 5% and ScotRail were getting 5%. At one of the last pay meetings they were explaining that the police went in for 3.6% and the rest of their pay got made up by, basically, giving away uniforms and cars and new offices and stuff. So, they've got none of that coming to them. And ScotRail's 5% deal was done with 2.2% pay rise guaranteed and 2.8% to change their terms and conditions of employment. The nurses have been offered 7%. I would suggest that they're considered a priority by the Scottish Government. If you go back earlier to what the Chief said, she says that the justice sector's not a priority for the Scottish Government and the SPS are restricted on what they can offer. The arguments for us is 2% was just a slap in the face and 98.6% rejected it. 5% wasn't much better, but just over 70% accepted it. If you keep looking at these figures and then have a look at what happened to Carstairs, where they're offer was 98% rejection, but when it came to the actual ballot 45% of people returned the ballot for strike action. The majority of their people that returned, returned it wanting to do a strike, but they didn't get ...55% of people didn't vote. So, let's not be under any illusion here, guys, we're sticking with the party line, because we cannot change it at this stage in the game. We've got to sit with the Scottish Prison Service with Adam Jobson and his team and sit with a straight face and a poker face saying, 'We asked for ten and then that's what we want. So, if you go away and then you come back to us and then the membership will decide.' But almost one of you have been, 'What do you think?' How much more money is there? Will we get 10%? If they're offering the nurses 7%, I'm going to suggest they're not going to give us 10%. The membership will decide that later on down the line. I've also had people approach us and saying, 'We need a steer for the National Committee and cards on the table, Jimmy, I voted no for the 5%, but I'm not going out on strike, because I cannot afford to go out on strike.' And there's not much of a turnaround

depending on what they come back with. If they come back with. For 30% acceptance, take that up 5%, 10%, 15%, we're going to struggle to get the figures in that's required for the trades dispute. The whole idea of the debate is basically, just to get all this stuff out here and it was good that John brought it forward, based on the fact of what the Chief Executive said and the Minister said. I'm asking technically, is the reality check ...do we need reality check or do we just stick to our guns? That's the bottom line. We're just going to stick to our guns. But if our members are swayed, I've got one shot a strike, do you all know that? There's one bash at this. See, if we go for a ballot and the returns are poor, we're done forever. They're already talking about where the money's coming for next year. A blind man can see it's our shift patterns. If they come for our shift patterns and we've had the ballot for a strike and we say, 'Oh, we're going to strike if you change our shift patterns.' 'Whatever.' So, the pay negotiation team is sticking rigidly to the instructions by the membership. That's what we've put, that's what we want, but we'll come back to the membership every single time. It's just that people have got to be aware, what is the breaking point for the membership? So, I'm glad John brought this here so we can get the different branch's different thoughts on this and debate's always healthy for the soul. Thanks, guys.

JOHN CAIRNEY – SNC CHAIR: Thanks, Jim. No, sorry. Well, that was the debate and as I say, thanks to Shotts for bringing it. It gives us certainly, a wee bit more as well we can discuss going forward, so thanks to those that participated in the debate. And that brings Conference to an end, so again, thank you. And 6.30 'til 7.30 tonight there are pre ...

<End of Recording>