

Mr Needham,

My apologies for submitting this to you but I feel I have no faith that these issues will be dealt with if heard by anyone within Care and Justice.

I originally submitted a grievance in October 2014 to Jerry Petherick and after a grievance hearing heard by Lee Hanford I was persuaded to withdraw my grievance on understanding that the Director Ben Saunders would be “dealt” with, made to be more organised and not always give a heavy workload to a select few and that I would receive an answer to my policy queries regarding the temporary promotion process that I was made to complete twice when others hadn’t.

I received no answer to the policy elements of my grievance and my notes were sent back titled “Duncan Partridge grievance”. I challenged this at the time as I felt my concerns and issues had been largely ignored in an attempt to make them go away. Lee called shortly after this to ask if they could be used to form part of the evidence for Duncan’s grievance and to apologise for this.

On 29th April 2015 Ben then sent an e mail with spreadsheet attachment in which my medical information was detailed. This had been widely distributed within G4S with comments regarding how difficult my OH report had made me to manage. This document contained confidential medical details on both myself and lots of other staff and had been widely circulated against data protection principles. This incident was not investigated as a data loss or recorded by Kat Hilton as a data loss as per policy and IC advice. At the time I was told that it would not be investigated as I had not raised a formal grievance! My solicitor has advised that I report this and as such I will be reporting this to the Information Commissioner in due course.

At the time, this ongoing behaviour meant I could not cope and saw a Dr and was signed off sick with anxiety/stress and sciatica. I eventually felt able to return to work as I loved my job and did not wish to be forced to leave a job I enjoyed. I received no Return to work interview and no stress risk assessment, no follow up from Lee Hanford or Jerry Petherick although they were aware of the issues with my line manager and had met with other employees for similar issues prior to them leaving the business. On my return I was informed that Ben Saunders had discussed my absence with Sarah Newland (Head of Cedars) who in turn had discussed it with my colleagues telling them Ben had made reference to my absence being “ridiculous behaviour from a Senior Manager” this did nothing to reassure me that I was welcomed back.

For a while it was bearable at work, although felt I was still being ignored on issues such as ongoing bullying that I had formally raised with Ben and Steve Skitt and other issues at Brook. (Annex) This issue was never dealt with. After Ben was sent to Medway in early 2016 (to resolve the issues there in relation to bullying and false reporting, all of which were also occurring at Gatwick) Lee Hanford was covering the role as Director. Lee made improvements in reporting issues and dealing with problems and shortly before he left I was asked to investigate the same staff I had previously raised concerns about. I was pleased to do so as I knew I would thoroughly investigate this issue, shortly after this Ben returned and told me not to complete the investigation as he thought I should instead investigate a grievance brought by one of these staff. The fact that I would have highlighted the previous issue which Ben and Steve had not dealt with I feel was the reason I was taken off the investigation.

Bullying of staff at Brook House has also been highlighted by me and others and nothing has been done. This has been an ongoing issue and prior to his leaving, Nathan Ward completed an investigation in which he said bullying was rife on one wing at Brook and that this should be subject of a further investigation, yet again nothing was done. The environment at Gatwick is toxic because there is no faith by the majority of the SMT or DCMs that any issues are dealt with or that any decisions are made.

For a prolonged period of time I had a huge amount of staff vacancies at Tinsley House for a prolonged period, lots of staff were leaving due to issues with having to work at Brook House, changes to contracts which were managed appallingly by Ben and the POA and repeatedly late pay talks and decisions on annual leave. Tinsley House was due to close for refurbishment and expansion and I was told by Lee that I would be able to take the opportunity to complete training, complete contingency plans which had not been completed by the Security Senior Manager, have a separate site security rota to ensure we looked after those with genuine reasons not to work at Brook and ensure all of my staff could take the annual leave they had been denied due to my staffing figures. All of this was then completely ignored by Ben and Steve after I had briefed staff. I felt that I had been made to look like I had lied. Sara Edwards was part of these discussions and felt the same.

Ben and Steve very rarely visited Tinsley, leaving Sara and I to manage, which was fine but then they would interfere by making decisions on our behalf i.e. our staff would work at Brook and I would not be able to operate a core group of staff, this suited them at Brook, they had no regard for staff and when this was raised as an issue that meant people may leave Ben responded with "look at my face, is it bothered"

I had been informed that during the closure at Tinsley House, Sara and I would project manage both the decant and refurbishment at Tinsley House and as such we completed a great deal of work in relation to this. With no discussion and with no advertisement or Temporary promotion process, a DCM called Dean Brackenridge was temporarily promoted to E1 to manage the Brook House and Tinsley House projects. This frustrated and upset a great deal of existing staff who had been made to apply for previous roles and go through a process, myself included.

During the next few days I had heard rumours from Cedars staff via my DCOs that I would be replaced at Tinsley by Sarah Newland. I met with Ben on the 14th September at Tinsley and confronted the rumour by asking directly if this was the plan. I was informed that it had been looked into as part of cost savings and that he had meant to have a conversation with me about it. He said that it may be on the horizon but that it would most likely be part of re bid structure. I don't think this conversation would have taken place if I hadn't directly asked. Ben had come to Tinsley to see me following an absence after I was poorly on return from holiday, I assumed that I would be having a RTW interview. This didn't happen. Ben at the end of the discussion about my replacement asked how I was and then as he left said, we will consider that your RTW.

I have previously been involved with the costings for the Tinsley refurbishment, expansion and re structure but again found that I was being excluded from meetings that I would discover were taking place. I.e. I would be at Brook House and go to see Ben/Steve over something operational and would be told they were in a meeting with Kalpesh, Lee and Sarah about costs but I wouldn't have been invited. I was due to go to trading review on the 21st September with Steve and Sarah but at the last minute Steve e mailed me to tell me not to come. This is because this is where the financial

directors discuss proposals and when offering my role up as a saving was discussed/finalised. I know this takes time to get to this stage and is aware that this was being discussed as part of cost savings that the Home Office requested 2/3 months ago when a D2 post was offered up by G4S as a saving.

Despite this I was repeatedly told that the PDA (Cedars) which was due to close and come to Tinsley House would be a separate entity and that Sarah Newland and I would work together but be responsible for different areas, Sarah told me repeatedly that Jerry did not want a D1 as Head of Tinsley as this was not part of the structure and he already had a D1 as the deputy director. I was told repeatedly that the structure would be in place until the re bid in 2018.

I was informed that a mistake had been made whereby the REAL G4S profit margin was revealed to Colin Welsh of the Home Office, who realising we had been making more money than we should, a margin of around 28% when we should only have been making 5.25%, demanded savings further to those we had offered. At this point, I was questioning the staff we had formally asked the Home Office for as I knew we had only requested 60 to run Tinsley, yet Kalpesh Mistry, the accountant and Lee Hanford were asking for money for 80 staff. I had real issues with this and made numerous calls between Ben, Lee and Kalpesh where I was told that I was wrong until I produced the document that rationalised the staff for re-opening (the 60 DCO model) This was then altered slightly but remained above my submission and what is necessary to safely run Tinsley.

On Wednesday 5th October I spent the day in meetings discussing the future of Tinsley and the PDA as Ben had led us to believe he had yet to make decisions on how Tinsley/Cedars would be run and managed. These meetings were to discuss the staffing (which Lee and Ben had failed to agree so was left with me to resolve while Ben was on Leave), the re bid and to have a joint approach to informing Tinsley and Cedars staff of what would happen. At this meeting it was decided (finally) that the families would be managed by PDA and Sarah and that the male part of Tinsley would be separately run by myself. We spent the morning putting a plan together to inform staff and ensure we considered how the selection process for each element would be run. During this process HR Bryony Farey was present and we went through how I had planned to profile and select staff, how I saw Tinsley running and what I had done so far. Work was allocated to me and Sarah and we arranged dates for full meetings and consultations with staff together so it would be a "joint approach and they would see the Tinsley Cedars element working together." (ie Head of cedars and me Head of Tinsley) During this meeting it was repeatedly raised that communication was key and that as a company we needed to have a process with integrity and always told that we need to be fair and transparent!!

We went from this meet to another, a progress meeting at Tinsley. Where I was given choice of carpets, colors etc and had lots of input. At this point I felt really positive, I had been included; felt I'd been listened too and was positive about the future for Tinsley and looking forward to all of the changes I had planned. Sarah came with me, and as we have had a fair relationship in the past I asked her directly if she was aware of the rumour about re bid and her taking over. She clearly looked uncomfortable and said she had seen a financial slide after the mistake with the profit margins being shown to the Home Office, and then pretended she had not been told although did admit that she had seen Kalpesh costings for re structure with a 50K saving but then back tracked saying that it could be her or me, I said it wasn't her as she earned more like 60K and she went quiet. I said that I wished it wasn't all cloak and dagger and that if this was going to happen at some point