

All I want is **DISENGAGEMENT** from a relationship which has been dysfunctional interpersonally and for the wider project.

I want to perform my job functions as conscientiously and professionally as possible. I need to feel supported to take on the burden of providing a quality experience to students and running the courses.

Maybe I'm just sensitive, I've lost several nights sleep worrying about all this at various times. My motivation has been adversely affected.

I would have hoped that my expressions of unease over the last year might be enough to convince you that a change might avoid further grief, especially at this point of beginning a new stage of development.

If it is, then consider some of **the options**:

The LSC only care about their output, qualifications. They don't care how we organise as long as we deliver.

A team of equals might perform better than a hierarchy. Angela is an equal worker and has definable functions and responsibilities.

A Management Committee is a common accountability structure for this type of undertaking. Just like the current Trust members. This could evolve into a more independent body.

Lynn Gillett (O4V) made several constructive comments about management during her visit including that it can be hard to cede power and responsibility to others.

I don't want to be scape-goated or demonised, just because I want to retain my human dignity.

After Patti left, AB insisted that "personal differences" had caused the problem, rather than competences and treatment of volunteers. I think I was blamed for creating a problem, when all I did was point it out.

7 01 I took Angela's suggestion that I might have Asperger's Syndrome as questioning my mental health, effectively calling me mad.

10 02 I was given a "verbal warning" for my "tone of voice", when I requested that AB clarify labyrinth design, after repeated requests.

I think AB interpreted my need to know ( to timetable and arrange work ) as too demanding of her.

This initial criticism was later added to in very personal and generalised terms. AB explained that she thought my "attitude", "behaviour" and "personality" were problematic. She did not specify exactly what was wrong or what I should do, but she did assert that "all the members of the Trust agreed" with her.

Then came the very protracted meeting, when I was threatened with a "written warning" for not asking to go to the loo.

This warning was then suddenly demoted to an "oral warning", with no consequence to my "record".

6/03 At a one-to-one (formerly “supervision”) meeting, AB admitted to RC that she had often made decisions contrary to RC’s expressed views, despite actually agreeing with him.

10/03 DM suggested a strategy of increased autonomy for the LSC project, without team meetings, more hands off management and less focus on hierarchy as a means of disengaging and avoiding future conflicts. He expected AB to communicate this to RC, but she did not.

Despite the project’s unquestioned success in meeting its funder’s targets and fulfilling its ethical remit, the weekly reality has been more of a struggle than it need be for workers, volunteers and clients. I want the future to be smoother and more harmonious for all.

**OG4H** Some of the issues arising are relevant to the dynamic and effectiveness of the project team:-

Crucial systems have been inadequate. There has been considerable budgetary confusion – no spend for ages then panic-spending.

Accounts now set up on Excel, thanks to John Mortimer. (RC suggestion and action).

The facilitation of the project has regularly been favoured over the delivery (people in the garden).

Project workers have bonded together in opposition to the manager.

**Unstone** For me the route of appeal on all these matters, SB (Chair), seems inappropriate, especially to handle problems with AB.

AB has often spoken on behalf of the Trust in advance of the members being able to have a view on a matter.

It could be possible to become cynical or sceptical about the rhetoric and publicity of an organisation if a core element seems to be contradicting its principles.

**OCN**

The process of developing the **bid, budget and structure** of the LSC-funded course has already been fraught with difficulties:-

At a meeting at DM’s house, to discuss the original **bid**, AB accused me of always undermining the project and left, curtailing further discussion.

At a meeting to discuss the **budget** at Albert Rd, AB refused to discuss my suggestions, so vehemently that she said I was no longer welcome in her house. I was literally excluded from contributing to this process. (and also accused of “getting one co-worker sacked” and “now trying to get another one sacked”).

I had arranged with AB to meet at Unstone and travel with her to Derby to meet with the **LSC** (16/4/03). She did not meet me and would not tell me where to go when I wanted to travel independently. Her explanation was that she thought I might be a “liability”.

threats. Enforcing will over reason. Openly abusive (SV – “incompetent”)  
Blame culture.  
Believe the hype. Assertions despite the reality.  
Unresponsive to repeated requests  
Acting as if rather than on behalf of Trust