Mr Paul Csoban Executive Director Forensic and Scientific Services Health Support Queensland

5<sup>th</sup> February 2017

Dear Paul

Thank you for your letter dated 3 February 2017 where you have addressed three areas in the hope to assist in my transition back into the workplace and to ensure both my expectations and HSQ's are met.

I can see that the letter addresses both conversations you and I have had, but also conversations I have had with Ms Kara Frederiksen regarding my return to work. Although you have been very clear in addressing my concerns, there are a number of incorrect perceptions and statements that I would seek to clarify for the record.

I appreciate at this stage you are satisfied with the actions of Ms Brisotto and Ms Whelan to address the concerns at the local level, however I understand this is only a preliminary view as the investigation report has not been completed by Livingstones at this time. It is nonetheless concerning that you have already formed any view given your assertion that the full facts and circumstances need to be ascertained.

I look forward to any relevant findings from the report being tabled with me, or at the least, being provided to me as part of any outcome advice that I receive as a complainant in this matter. I particularly look forward to clarification as to why their actions were deemed appropriate or not.

Although it is stated I want to know why Mr McNevin remained within the workplace, the questions I asked on 1 February 2017 were directed towards subject officers - I wanted to understand if it was normal practice to suspend or move a subject officer from the workplace, as opposed to the complainant.

I note your reasons for not removing Mr McNevin from his substantive position at this time.

In relation to point number 3, I would like to clarify that although I raised the issues with Justin Howes (HP6) regarding the scientific process, these concerns had been raised with me by staff - therefore I was escalating concerns as required within my role as one of two supervising reporting HP5s, and therefore the concerns are the concerns of the *collective reporting team*, and not restricted to me as an individual. This is clearly evidenced in the

documents supporting my statement, as provided to the Livingstones' investigator and yourself.

I appreciate that you are getting the concerns of staff investigated externally via an expert forensic review, and I await the outcome of that process.

I am eager to return to my substantive role, completing all duties, and have obtained a full medical clearance to enable this.

Although you assert that I indicated in our meeting on 19 January 2017 that it would be inappropriate for me to undertake reporting and court work regarding sexual assault cases, I would like to clarify that I do not hold this concern and did not give any such indication as alleged or at all. My recollection is that it was suggested to me that the organisation (QH) held concerns, and that it was also suggested to me that the Queensland Police may have concerns, regarding my ability to give evidence on such cases given the issues raised. I simply acknowledged the statement made by Jade Franklin - I did not explicitly agree with it, nor did I adopt that view as my own. As the process has been modified since August 2016 and the other reporting staff who raised the concerns are continuing to report/peer review, I too am confident in undertaking the work with the process currently in place and would seek to return to the execution of my substantive role under the same conditions as the other reporting officers whose concerns I escalated. I am not clear as to why the organisation seems to be taking an approach that seeks to isolate me as the sole person to hold and raise these concerns, and thus apparently warranting special treatment, when there is documentary evidence that clearly shows otherwise.

The work arrangements outlined in your letter, per a conversation held with Ms Frederiksen on 24 January 2017, were the subject of a dialogue in which Ms Frederiksen was seeking to explore any viable options with me for the construction of a suitable duties plan. As I obtained a full medical clearance on 31 January 2017, clearing me to return to my normal substantive role as of 2 February 2017, it is my understanding that these options are neither required nor valid any longer.

Further, as I expressed to Ms Frederiksen at the time, the only one of the suggested options which I was seeking to explore in earnest was not attending management meetings - given the incident that occurred in the management meeting on June 9 2016. As management meetings are not a substantial portion of my role, with attendance required once a fortnight, I believe a simple work around can be found pending the finalisation of all investigations. I am willing to work with Mr Howes upon my return to facilitate this matter.

The fact remains that I have a full medical clearance to return to work and you have no medical evidence to substantiate a risk of aggravation on my return and have undertaken no risk assessment in this respect.

Furthermore the medical clearance as to my capacity to resume work is relevant and if QH considers that others in the workplace pose a Hazard and a Risk to me or anyone else then QH needs to address such concerns with me in order to ensure that I am not disadvantaged or treated detrimentally.

I appreciate the options you have given regarding alternative duties, however, as I have now clarified my position with regard to the testing and reporting aspects, I have a full medical clearance, and I am willing to complete all aspects of my role (with further discussion regarding management meetings), I would insist that I return to my substantive role as soon as possible.

I look forward to returning to my role, given the impact this is having on me financially, and given that as of 2 February 2017 I am cleared to return to my full normal role and am ready, willing and able to do so.

Yours sincerely,

Amanda Heeves