

Private and Confidential

David Waldock



12th May 2017

Grievance Outcome

Dear David

I have previously invited you to a meeting at which I planned to deliver your grievance outcome in person with you however you declined to attend.

Therefore I am writing in response to the grievance hearing held on 06th March 2017 in which you claimed you had been treated unfairly following a meeting with Steve Skitt, Deputy Director.

Your grievance against Deputy Director Steve Skitt was entitled "*corporate bullying*". The grievance was centred around a meeting that took place between you and Steve Skitt, with Caz Dance-Jones also in attendance, on 02nd February 2017; the outcomes of which you stated were;

- You were told a complaint had made against you by the Home Office, but you were not allowed to see the complaint
- You were not permitted to explain your version of events
- You were removed from your position in Visits
- You had formal action initiated against you (behavioural monitoring) without an investigation

During your grievance hearing, you also claimed that on 17th February 2017, following a staff briefing in the Visits Hall, Steve Skitt looked at you and commented to Juls Williams; "*that is disgusting*". You believed Steve was referring to you and that he made such a comment because you are gay, and Steve doesn't like gay men.

Each of these points is considered below;

a. Not allowed to see the complaint from the Home Office

I conclude that you were not allowed to see the complaint from the Home Office; this would be standard procedure whilst the complaint was investigated. You would only be notified of who the complainant was should this lead to formal action under the disciplinary process. However, I also conclude that an investigation did not subsequently take place in relation to this complaint.

b. Not permitted to explain your version of events

I conclude that you were not permitted to explain your version of events during the meeting with Steve as it was not deemed the appropriate time to discuss the matter in detail, this would be correct as the complaint would need to be investigated and you would have your opportunity to explain your version of events at an investigation interview. However, as above, I conclude that an investigation did not ensue.

c. Removed from your position in Visits

I conclude that this was an appropriate course of action following a formal complaint. However I believe this could have been better explained with a letter detailing the rationale behind the decision and the expected timeframe for the change of work location. This may have helped provide clarity for you and structured your expectations about the changes required from you before you would be permitted to return to Visits.

d. Formal action initiated without an investigation

I conclude that as a result of the meeting on 02nd February 2017, you were placed on “behavioural monitoring”, to be conducted by DCM Dave Roffey. The idea behind this was apparently for Dave to meet with you on a regular basis, to review your performance and provide feedback on your behaviour and attitude. Dave advised that he has offered you support in terms of working on Residential Units, but has not held any formal meetings with you or offered you any formal feedback. As such this process has not achieved the intended outcome.

e. “Disgusting” comment made by Steve Skitt

I conclude that this comment was made in the context of a conversation with Juls Williams about the cleanliness of Brook House and was not directed at you, either as an individual or as a homosexual man.

Summary of conclusions

I find your grievance to be substantiated, in so much as actions were taken that would normally result from a formal investigation, which in this case, did not take place. As such I have recommended that a formal investigation takes place into the complaint raised and that you are provided with the full opportunity to explain your version of events at an investigation interview.

You do have the right to appeal against my decision and should do so within 7 days of receipt of this letter.

Your appeal should be addressed to Ben Saunders Centre Director at the address above.

Yours sincerely,

Signature

Sarah Newland
Head of Tinsley House Borders and PDA
G4S Central Government Services (UK) Ltd