

SPEAK OUT SAFELY MEETING

**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19th September 2016
at 2.30pm in the Executive Office**

Member		Attendance	Apologies
Mr Andrew Higgins (AH)	Non-Executive Director	☑	
Mrs Alison Kelly (AK)	Director of Nursing & Quality		☑
Mrs Sue Hodgkinson (SH)	Director of HR & People (Chair)	☑	
Ms Hayley Cooper (HC)	Staff side Chair	☑	
Mrs Stephen Cross (SC)	Director of Corporate & Legal Services	☑	

In attendance: Ann Baker, Clinical Education Manager
Steve Gregg-Rowbury, Head of HRWBS
Mary Crocombe (Note taker)

1.	Apologies Apologies were received from Alison Kelly.	Action
2.	Welcome & review of the actions from the last meeting SH explained that AB and SGR had been invited to feedback to the meeting following their fact finding with regards to the R&D and Volunteer Whistleblower issues. It was agreed to do this before reviewing the actions. Members to let MC have any comments on the Action Log.	ALL
3.	Update on issues raised since the last meeting <u>Research and Development</u> AH gave a brief update on the background to this issue. The fact finding undertaken had taken more time than anticipated due to the number of people involved. AB then explained that following the fact finding exercise she had completed a piece of reflection. The fact finding had taken over 100 hours and involved 15,000 words to transcribe which had been very time consuming. AB had found the process emotionally draining and had concerns that her professional relationship might be compromised. AB felt that it would be helpful for the SoS Team to be more explicit in what they expect from people undertaking fact finding on their behalf and may be a template to use. Also clarify the difference between an investigation/fact finding and SoS processes/HR investigations. SH asked AB if there were any themes following her fact finding. AB replied that the staff she had spoken to had been very scared of being identified, and that the staff's perception and the management side's perception were totally different. Staff had felt that JA's role had not been advertised and that there was no clarity	

or transparency. AH added that the management side were still not aware of what had been said by the staff which had led to difficulties when speaking with them. AH had participated in the discussions with management and had informed them that it wasn't an investigation and not a formal process, but was in response to a Speak out Safely concern that had been raised and that there was no fixed format (AH felt that this in itself creates issues/ambiguity). SH asked what the staff and management's perspective was of an outcome. AB replied that the staff that she had met with are expecting that something will happen, but don't know what. AH suggested that there should be a meeting with the management team to go through the issues and ask them how they plan to resolve them. Would then need to look at how this message is fed back to staff, who want to remain anonymous (out of the 8 staff interviewed by AB, only 3 were happy to put their names on it). AB had not produced a formal report as it had not been a formal investigation, but had transcripts of all the meetings.

SH thanked AB for all her hard work on the fact finding. Members agreed that next steps would be to agree how to deal with the texts that HC was expecting from the staff following this meeting. Also, there was a need to meet with the management team as well. HC would also find it useful to have sight of AB's transcripts of the interviews. Agreed that staff should be told that it had been discussed today, and that further information would be given to them as soon as possible. In the meantime need to agree who will meet with SB and JA, and have a frank and honest conversation with them and find out how quickly they can come back with an action plan to address the issues raised. HC asked if it would be helpful to provide the feedback separately to management and staff. SH to pick up with AK in the morning about speaking to the staff. SoS spreadsheet to be update to include AB's reflection and transcripts of interviews. SGR to be asked for his input into a review of the SoS policy and process following his own experience of fact finding.

SH
MC/DC
SGR

Volunteer Whistleblower

SH explained the background to this complex issue. A former chaplaincy volunteer had raised concerns in relation to the training received as a volunteer, Dementia training and also about the behaviour of another volunteer when visiting the wards. SGR had been asked to undertake the fact finding, and meet with the former volunteer, following her correspondence with the Trust. SH had asked SGR to come to today's meeting to give a short précis of progress to date. SGR began by explaining that [redacted] had raised her concerns in June and that he had been asked by SH to undertake a low level investigation into what had happened and the sequence of events. SGR had met with John Kingsley (Chaplain) about the recruitment process for chaplaincy volunteers. SGR had then made arrangements, via SH's PA, for him and Joe O'Grady to meet with [redacted] at her home as she didn't want to come onto the site. [redacted] was asked for her side of the events and she made reference to a number of different things that had culminated in her complaint, including her mother's Dementia and therefore her sensitivity to it. SGR and JOG had taken independent notes of the interview. At the end of the interview reference was made to the £[redacted] paid by [redacted] to attend a chaplaincy staff Away Day and that JK had been spoken to. [redacted] felt that she should have been interviewed

	<p>first, as this was 'natural justice' and was adamant that she wanted the interview stopped. SGR informed [I&S] that the notes of the interview would be written up and sent to her first to read through to agree their accuracy. SGR and JOG had joined their interview notes together into one document and this had been sent to [I&S]. Unbeknown to SGR, adaptations should have been made to the document due to [I&S] dyslexia. [I&S] eventually responded saying that they had not been provided in a format she could read. They were then resent in a different format but to date SGR had not received a response from [I&S] even after sending further correspondence that the Trust was awaiting a response. SH added that the Trust had also received correspondence for from [I&S] and that this had been responded to. [I&S] had also contacted the CQC, DOH and other major stakeholders and raised a concern that SH is the Exec Lead on her 'case'. It was agreed that the next steps would be that once [I&S] had signed off the notes of her interview, to respond to her formally. Members recognised there were lessons to be learnt from this case, including how chaplaincy volunteers are recruited. Sian Williams had offered to re-open the complaint around [I&S] mother and the failings [I&S] perceives. SC added that feedback should be given to John Kingsley and the other volunteers as soon as possible. Agreed that a timeline needed to be put on a response from [I&S]. The Group thanked SGR for his work on this.</p> <p><u>Updating Medical Students</u></p> <p>HC informed members that she had already spoken to the 3rd and 4th year Medical Students on behalf of AK and SH. Need to find out if there are any further regular dates or forums setup.</p> <p><u>Ward 54</u></p> <p>An anonymous letter had been received regarding the Ward Manager. The letter had been shared with Carmel Healey, Head of Nursing for Planned Care, and she had spoken to the Ward Manager, who had subsequently completed a reflection and also an Action Plan, of which a number of actions had already been completed. SH offered to share the Action Plan with members.</p> <p><u>Anaesthetic Secretary</u></p> <p>This concern had been raised in a letter to SH in relation to the treatment of a medical secretary in Anaesthetics. SH had responded initially and then through the Planned Care Team. Two Consultants and their Clinical Team Leader had not been happy with the response and SH had since met with them and would be writing to them again. They had been concerned about the admin support in the Department and a full response had been given regarding the medical secretary, and as the Division were dealing with the issue of admin support, SH felt this issue could be closed.</p>	<p>MC/DC</p> <p>SH</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Freedom to Speak Up Guardians – Letter from Dr Henrietta Hughes, National Guardian</p> <p>SH had received a letter from Dr Henrietta Hughes who was hosting a 'Freedom to</p>	

	<p>Speak Up Guardians' Day' on Thursday 13th October in London. Unfortunately AK, SH and HC were unable to attend. AH to advise MC if he would be able to attend and MC to check if SPC could go. If it was not possible to send someone, will look to see if there are any slide packs from the event. Need to decide as well whether the Trust is going to appoint to this post or not. Agreed that a proposal/option appraisal with costings should be produced. SH added that she was aware that both CWP and Wirral had appointed a Guardian.</p>	<p>AH MC</p>
5.	<p>Any other business</p> <p>There was no further business.</p>	
6.	<p>Date and time of next meeting</p> <p>MC to look at arranging the next meeting for Monday 17th October, following the Quality, Safety & Patient Experience Committee. Agenda to focus on R&D and Speak up Guardian.</p>	<p>MC</p>