

Human Resources – Meeting Record

Meeting Reference: Investigation meeting

Date of Meeting: 10/02/2020

Present: Suki Dhesi (Investigating Officer) and Stephanie Richardson (Learning Manager)

Minutes: [REDACTED] (People Services)

Key: SD (Suki Dhesi), SR (Stephanie Richardson), [REDACTED]

SD thanked SR. She introduced herself as the investigating officer and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the allegations that have been raised by a member of staff in a grievance. She then stated that this grievance had been raised by Betty Knight (BK) and that everything discussed in this meeting would remain confidential and would not be discussed outside of this room. SR agreed with this.

SD referred to the allegation from BK in her grievance. She explained that a drop-in observation was conducted on 3rd December by SR and Claire Scott (CS). Both CS and SR attended the lesson for around 25 minutes before leaving and BK was then invited to a meeting by CS shortly after to discuss feedback from the observation. This meeting left BK feeling belittled, insulted and unfairly treated.

SD referred to a sentence in the grievance where BK highlighted in an email to SR and CS that the feedback and recommendation for IIP was unfair and inappropriate.

SD explained to SR that she wanted to understand the events that took place. She asked SR how she proceeded to do the observation and what her rationale was for doing it. SR replied that BK had made allegations before and had been very resistant to feedback before. She explained that BK has had quite a few observations where teaching hasn't been very good. When feedback is given to BK she flares up and feels criticised.

SD referred to the previous observations, and asked SR what would happen if an observation was deemed to be unsatisfactory under the old process. SR replied that Peter Cox (PC) did one before and would pass the observation to SR where she would then meet with the employee to flag these problems. She explained that there are similar problems highlighted by CS in her observation with a lack of creating a learning environment and lack of rigour being highlighted. SR explained that PC did that one particular observation and then passed it to SR. She commented that she's got this observation as an attachment and can send this to SD if needed. SR then spoke to BK and gave feedback. BK was very resistant and explained PC didn't understand English GCSE.

SD then referred to the most recent observation and asked if SR and CS went into the room separately. SR replied that both SR and CS went in together and sat at the back of the room, around two desks apart. She explained that she didn't talk to any students and SR smiled at BK as she came into the room.

SD asked SR what the commonalities were between the feedback from CS and SR. SR replied that they both felt the lesson was inadequate and required improvement. There was a complete lack of pace first 10/20 minutes where BK was giving individual feedback to one student at a time. However, in this time no learning going on in the rest of the class.

SD asked SR to confirm when the feedback meeting took place between CS and BK. SR explained that CS and SR met straight after the lesson to discuss feedback. CS felt it was such a concern she wanted to meet with BK that same day. CS sent BK an email inviting her to meet to discuss feedback and they met later that day. SR explained that because of what was going to be discussed at the meeting and the nature of the conversation, it was felt that CS should give feedback without SR present.

SD explained that the next SR heard from BK was an email she was copied into. She asked SR if she remembered how long it was before BK sent the response. SR replied it was quite quickly after. SD explained that the grievance from BK suggests that there was a wait of two weeks for a response to this email. SD asked SR if she could remember if this was the case. SR replied that she wasn't sure on the exact timescale. But if she had delayed sending the response it would have been because she was getting advice and checking who should be sending the response. SR explained she would forward email chain of BK contesting the IIP.

SD explained that SR then proposed a meeting to discuss the IIP with BK. She asked if this meeting had taken place. SR replied that this meeting was declined by BK. SD asked SR if there was there anything else she heard afterwards. SR replied that she thought she went one more email for support after asking to discuss the IIP and this was when she got the email saying that BK would be contacting her lawyers. SR added that BK has always felt that she hasn't been well respected by the college and any offer for support from observations has been taken personally.

She made reference to May 2017 where two members of staff moved on from the college and these posts were advertised to staff over the summer. BK did not apply for these posts and was very upset that she was not offered the role. She told Jon Myers she was being discriminated against and so JM gave her 0.3 fractional contract and A Level teaching which is what BK had wanted. This teaching on the A Level course from BK was then seen to be inadequate and parental complaints were received. SR explained she did an observation off the back of complaints (around February 2018). She then gave feedback to BK and BK felt very criticised. SR and BK then had conversations to decide whether BK wanted to carry on with A Level teaching. SR confirmed she had emails of these discussions. BK felt she couldn't do teaching.

SD then explained there was another angle she wanted to explore. She made reference to BK's grievance where BK compares the feedback from her observation with the observation of her husband. SD highlighted that they received different scores for both Equality and Diversity and Safeguarding. SD asked SR what subject BK's husband taught at the college and SR replied this was Design and Technology. SD asked how SR felt about the difference in scores and BK being marked lower for these topics. SR replied that she felt quite uncomfortable about that as they were completely different lessons and different environments.

SD explained that BK's last comment about the lesson was about the opportunity to support a SEND student. She asked SR how she would know the student would have learning needs. SR replied that the class profile on CIS would tell you this but she also has a cut out for each class in her planner detailing if any students had any learning needs. SD asked if then that was a judgement by SR and CS that this individual wasn't being challenged and they could have been capable of more. SR replied that she felt all the students could have been challenged. An issue that has been had with BK before is that lessons are well planned to ensure students are all at the same level, but BK doesn't stick to lesson planning and will quite often send students to the computer room for research. SR explained that she asked BK on this once and BK said at the time that the students were doing writing and editing which wasn't

on the lessons plans. SD asked if SR had tried to go into the class for an observation that day. SR replied that there was a note on the class door saying they were in LRC.

SD confirmed she had one last question for SR. She referred to the text in BK's grievance relating to the policy and how the observers should conduct themselves during the observation in a manner which respects the professional duties of the teacher. SD explained that in the grievance from BK, she has written that CS and SR did not follow the procedure and they're approach completely contradicts the policy. SD then referred to the text around how a drop-in observation should not take place if the students are sitting a timed assessment. However, BK had explained that she had prepared a timed assessment for after the break. SR replied that this wasn't the case. When CS and SR went in to the room BK was doing feedback on homework. While they were there BK went on to work on metaphors and similes and that was it. SD asked SR if there was therefore any indication that there was to be an assessment in the lesson. SR replied that there was not.

SD explained that she had now brought up everything she wanted to raise. She asked SR if there was anything she wanted to add at all. SR explained that whenever she had tried to help BK or when there have been parental complaints received, she has taken it personally. SR explained that in the past BK has acted irrationally and has a habit of posting stuff on social media about how she's in a dark place.

SD explained that with regards to process from now, SD would be speaking to a number of individuals and if there is any need to speak to people again they will be called. She asked if SR could send her the email regarding the two week delay in response (around 3rd December). SR confirmed she would do this.

End of meeting.