

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

First Witness Statement of Stacie Dean

I provide this statement in response to a request under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules
2006 dated 4th February 2022

I, Stacie Dean will say as follows:

1. I am currently the Head of Placements, Casework, Release and Operating Contracts for the Youth Custody Service (YCS) and have worked for the YCS since March 2017.
2. Prior to taking up the above position I had previously been employed by G4S at the Gatwick IRCs. I held various roles at Gatwick including Residential Manager at Tinsley House, Temporary Head of Safety and Security at Brook House for a short period and then Head of Tinsley House. Whilst based at Tinsley House I completed duty director duties on rota across Brook House.
3. I left G4S formally in February 2017 although had been off sick for the previous 6 months so had not been on site since around August 2016. I was not employed by G4S during the relevant period noted (1st April 2017 to 31st August 2017). I left the company after a long period of work-related stress associated with dysfunctional and bullying management.
4. I was asked by the inquiry to provide a copy of the grievance I submitted to G4S in October 2014; I do not hold copies of the grievance you refer to in the letter at point 2. I have also been asked who requested that I withdraw this grievance. I recall speaking to Lee Hanford on receipt of a copy of the notes of my grievance meeting which were titled something like “record of interview

Witness Name: Stacie Dean
Statement No: 1
Exhibits: 0

with Stacie Dean in relation to Duncan Partridge Grievance” I challenged this because I had taken out a grievance in my own right, not attached in any way to Duncan’s issues. Lee told me that if all of the information was presented as a single grievance it would present a fuller case and, in this way, it would mean Ben was managed and dealt with. He asked me for permission to use my interview outcome in Duncan’s case and requested I withdraw my individual grievance.

5. I have been asked to comment on whether I noticed any changes to Ben Saunders management style after the grievance was submitted, as you point out Ben remained in post and I don’t recall any longstanding changes to his behaviour or approach although vaguely recall a short period of superficial effort on his part. I have been asked to comment on whether I felt any action had been taken and whether my concerns had been resolved. I do not recall any action being taken or considering anything had or indeed would be done. I felt my concerns had been glossed over and that there was no intention of anything said being dealt with. I asked whether I had taken any further action and can confirm that I spoke on numerous occasions with other Senior Managers including in HR after this about Ben, including Jerry Petherick but didn’t submit a further grievance as far as I recall.
6. I have been asked whether I raised concern about the treatment of detainees earlier than October 2014 I can’t recall when I first raised concern about the treatment of detainees formally. I know I raised the matter (along with the culture of staff bullying) in various meetings as did other members of the SMT. I have been asked whether I have any further in relation to the complaint I made in 2015 and recall that regarding DCOs Instone Brewer and Fagbo, I raised concern that it was a well discussed issue (at senior meetings) that assurances had been given that they would not be allowed to work together on the same wing and that they were bullying detainees yet whenever I went to Brook House, they were always rostered together. Other than that, I have nothing further to raise on that point.

7. I have been asked whether I received a response to my email on 25th October 2015 which raised concern about DCO treatment of detainees, I do not recall a response to the email of the 25th, neither do I recall if any action was taken. Similarly, when I forwarded the email to Lee Hanford I do not recall any subsequent action taken as a result of the email. I was asked whether I have any further comment on this matter and confirm I do not.
8. I have been asked to respond to the point that Ms Brown raised concern at an SMT meeting at which I was present. I do recall regularly that Ms Brown was one of the SMT members who repeatedly raised concern about staff treatment of detainees. Both myself and Ms Brown were concerned that some members of staff as well as detainees were being regularly subjected to bullying behaviour from some staff. The response of the SMT was consistently uninterested, I do not recall specific dates or times but do remember the general approach to any of us raising concern or complaint would be fairly generic and non-committal and the lack of any action was frustrating. At times I think the view from some SMT members was that the situation was amusing so it was far from taken seriously.
9. Having been asked why I sent a complaint to Peter Neden rather than Jerry Petherick and whether I have a copy of this I can confirm that I do not have a copy of the grievance I sent to Peter Neden but remember that I sent this to him rather than Jerry Petherick as Jerry was fully aware of the culture and issues at Brook House and chose to take no action or provide any support. I had no faith at all that anything further would be done. As far as I can recall I did not receive a response from Mr Neden although was contacted very swiftly by the G4S legal team to talk to me about the under-reporting and profit issue I raised. This appeared to be the only concern for the company. Having been asked to provide more information on this, I can't remember anything further than is contained within the letter regarding this unfortunately.

10. After a grievance meeting in January 2017, at which point I was off work on sick leave, where I informed Jerry Petherick and Alison Noble that I spent a short period of time working in the Security function at Brook House, my basis of informing them that DCO's were dealing spice was from me being aware of the information received from various sources that the DCOs mentioned were dealing spice. I had also seen security reports when I was acting as duty director. Additionally, detainees would ask to speak to me when I was at Brook House and would tell me. I submitted security reports on this issue myself. This also appeared to be a common talking point and was widely acknowledged. As I did not return to the business, I am unaware if anything was done and I did not receive a response to my grievance, choosing instead to terminate the relationship. I am not aware why Ben chose to move the original investigation into DCO Instone Brewer and DCO Fagbo away from me to Juls Williams.
11. I have been asked to comment on the outcome of disciplinary action and grievances in relation to the two DCOs. I believe I was absent as a result of stress for the events mentioned here as I do not recall these events taking place.
12. I have no further information I can provide at this point in relation to grievances I raised with G4S.

<u>Statement of Truth</u>
I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.
I am content for this witness statement to form part of the evidence before the Brook House Inquiry and to be published on the Inquiry's website.

Witness Name: Stacie Dean
Statement No: 1
Exhibits: 0

Name	Stacie Dean
Signature	Stacie Dean
Date	15/03/2022

Witness Name: Stacie Dean
 Statement No: 1
 Exhibits: 0