

The Countess of Chester Health Park Liverpool Road Chester CH2 1UL

Telephone: 01

Fax: 01

## STRICTLY PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Miss L Letby

01st December 2016

Dear Lucy,

Firstly thank you for your time today, I appreciate how difficult and challenging this situation has been.

As outlined, the purpose of the meeting was to discuss your grievance and this letter is to confirm my findings as detailed below with answers relating to all points raised in your grievance

The proposed plan of supervision of practice and repetition of competencies was not followed for any other member of staff, nursing or medical, and I wish to know why and if this was ever a true intention of the Trust.

I accept that there may have been a challenge with skill set, however numbers available according to the rotas I reviewed, demonstrated that this could have been an option, therefore I support this part of the grievance.

2: The reasons for me being instructed not to have contact with my NNU colleagues for an extended period of time.

I conclude that this was said with intention, however on reflection Karen Rees intended this to mean on a professional basis only, and not socially. This then led to miscommunication and misunderstanding, and therefore I uphold this part of the grievance.

3: Was I being investigated on a personal level and what is it that the external review may indicate in relation to me returning to NNU, and Why the external review panel did not know about my circumstances, and why so much emphasis has been put on waiting for the review when it is not looking at anything pertinent to my situation





I conclude that there was no personal investigation, but the Executive team have not been clear on what they expected the external review to demonstrate or not in relation to your situation, nor did they advise you of this.

4: I would like the Trust to outline to me how its values such as being 'open and honest' and we 'respect each other' have been adhered to in my situation

Whilst I recognise that the Board found themselves in a difficult position, I conclude that the trust have not been as open and honest with you as they could be, in relation to the circumstances.

5: I also wish to be informed of any evidence the Trust may have and the process they have followed.

During the course of this investigation I have not <u>seen been made aware</u>, nor has there been any allusion to, any evidence relating to any alleged wrongdoing by yourself. There has been repeated reference to a commonality between the dates and times that you were on duty and the collapse / deaths of a significant number of babies, but there is nothing to support that there is additional information or data beyond this, that has not been shared with you.

6: I would appreciate assurances from the Executive team that this has been dealt with appropriately and that my confidentiality is being maintained.

I conclude that the trust has not failed to protect your confidentiality with regard to the circumstances regarding your employment. That rReasonable steps were taken to maintain confidentiality but as with any large organisation, employees do talk amongst themselves and will speculate, despite the best efforts of management.

7: I would like to know exactly what I have been accused of / what allegations have been made and by who and how the Trust has dealt with this.

I conclude that I fully support the conclusion that Chris Green came to and uphold this part of the grievance:

"No party refutes that concerns were raised by the <code>Consultants</code>, in particular SB, to the Executive team around a perceived commonality between your presence on the NNU and the collapse/deaths of babies. I acknowledge that these concerns were raised through the appropriate channels in line with both the Trust Speak Out Safely Policy and the guidance proffered by the GMC (I.e. through the Executive team). However, I do not find that the consultants concerns, when reiterated to the Executive team were "clear, honest and objective" (GMC guidance). The evidence suggests that, whilst the Executive team acknowledged and appreciated these concerns, their preliminary fact-finding did not produce any information that prompted them to initiate either a formal internal or police investigation. I believe the intention was to continue to review this for the agreed 3 month period, prior to the loss of two triplets on the unit.



