

Attention Wayne Northey:

We are in receipt of your emails dated January 13 & 14, 2014 and while disappointed in their tone, we do wish to respond to the main content.

Firstly, you have asked for clarification in respect to recent activity involving WorkSafe BC. A medical report related to a stress-related injury was forwarded by a medical practitioner to WorkSafe BC, according to the requirements of law that all work-related accidents and injuries must be reported. It is then the responsibility of WorkSafe BC to determine if they will pay for the associated medical treatment, and if any other action is required. It is our understanding that WorkSafe BC assessed Colette Squires' current contract with M2/W2 and determined that she is currently considered independent, not a worker. They have referred the matter back for us to deal with ourselves. However, the process required certain forms and paperwork to be submitted by the agency to WorkSafe BC within a very short timeframe. The Board was also notified of Colette's intent to file a report of a stress-related injury, and was duty bound to exercise due diligence by completing and submitting the necessary forms as well as informing the staff of the investigation we believed might be pending. It is not our understanding that the board's role is to get in the middle of an investigation and risk being viewed by either party as interfering with an arm's length investigation. However, given that we have now been informed that this matter is outside the purview of WorkSafe BC, we are able to proceed with an internal investigation of our own. You can be assured that we take this matter seriously. Our first action was to establish a general bullying and harassment policy for all to abide by from here on forward. The second will be to address what happened between Esther and Colette on December 5, 2013, at the UFV Clearbrook site.

Secondly, you have stated that Colette's presence in the office makes the workplace toxic and unsafe for you and that you will continue to work from home as you have done since January 6, 2014. We as a board have witnessed both yourself and Colette commit to treating each other with respect in the workplace. While we acknowledge that feelings have a mind of their own not necessarily subject to rational discourse, we fail to see how someone with your history in the agency, staff support, and personality can legitimately claim to need to operate from home when there is a risk of Colette Squires being at the office. We have seen no evidence of you being bullied or harassed by Colette and reject the notion that you are a victim. We have witnessed her issue a sincere apology and commit to respectful conduct. You on the other hand have refused to acknowledge any responsibility or wrongdoing or need for any kind of adjustment of conduct or attitude to date. We trust you will fully attend to your duties as ED, and work at the office as needed, supporting by action the staff you claim to support and not contributing further to their uncertainty.

Thirdly, you have suggested the board is not involving the staff in the appointment of a new ED and quote from the memorandum of understanding. While the M.O.U. is simply what it states and not a document which is authoritative irrespective of changing circumstances and contingencies the parties need to cope with, we would also observe that your harsh criticisms are both premature and unwarranted since the board has every intention of involving the staff in such consultations prior to making any decision.

Fourthly, your accusations regarding the trustworthiness of our Board President are inappropriate and unprofessional. They should have no place in your leadership. Conflicts and disagreements in Christian Ministry among people who love and serve Jesus can be intense. A disgruntled departing leader has a choice as to how

they will move on. They can take what is often referred to as a “High Road”. They can also take a “low Road” and do serious damage to the organization they have served. It is not too late to confirm a positive legacy.

Fifth, you have complained of the handling of a confidential draft letter mistakenly sent to Colette Squires instead of the intended recipient, your wife, Esther. While we might see greater merit in your position if the correspondence were in regard to an unrelated matter and a person other than the actual recipient, this is not the case. By your own admission to us in your January 14 email, you stated;

“As is my norm, I had intended that the letter:

- be reviewed by Esther to help make appropriate changes, and to assist in nuancing the language;
- be written out in advance, so that I can assure that the wording is ultimately succinct respectful and firm;
- be read (after appropriate revisions) to Colette Squires face to face, with her (and others) holding a copy in her hand. I have always worked thus with staff.”

We can only conclude that the main thing that occurred was Colette receiving prematurely the letter fully intended for her and others (aside from nuancing). If what was presumed by you would have been Esther making changes that radically changed the tone, content and intent of the letter, then it would be incumbent on you as ED to apologize for the draft and instead produce the final amended copy you intended to read to Colette and others. We are further troubled by the sharing of this kind of sensitive, confidential, unprofessional, hurtful and harmful information with another person, whether or not you are married to them. You as ED have an obligation to confidentiality that should be obvious given your many and varied years of service. Furthermore, the Board expects that you or any ED should have consulted the Board, and specifically the Personnel Committee, to help resolve any issue arising that involves a conflict with a staff member or consultant to determine the most prudent course of action.

Having one’s spouse so intimately involved in such an intense personal conflict as the one between yourself and Colette and as reflected in the errant email, caused us to be skeptical about your characterization of the encounter between Esther and Colette as spontaneous, quiet, private, and respectful. If that is in fact the case, it is up to to Esther to clarify her meaning and intent to Colette in a manner that is private and respectful.

In summary, while we affirm the dedication both you and Esther have shown to the cause of Prison Ministry, personal attacks on the Board and Board President, and continual revisiting of what appears even to new members as old grievances, does not accomplish the good of M2/W2. We as a board are not alone in needing a cooperative and forgiving spirit. While we make no claim to being above reproach, we are troubled that you seem to feel you are.

As an employee of M2/W2 and accountable to the board, it is your duty to supervise the daily operations of this association. The carrying out of your mandate is not subject to whim but according to the commitment you have made to the organization and in keeping with decisions made by your board. We require that you return to your work in and out of the office and conduct the affairs of M2/W2 ethically & appropriately.

Sincerely,

The Board of M2/W2

January 20, 2014