

06.12.2023

A Report into the working environment and atmosphere at S4C



Capital Law Limited is a company (number 05841213) registered in England and Wales whose registered office is Capital Building, Tyndall Street, Cardiff, CF10 4AZ. VAT number 287 1463 77. A list of directors is available at Companies House. We use the term partner to refer to a director of the company or to an employee or consultant who is a lawyer with equivalent standing and qualifications. Capital Law Limited is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA ID 644688). Members of CONSULEGIS International Association of Lawyers.

Introduction

The S4C Authority (being S4C's Non-Executive Members) instructed us to conduct an independent fact-finding exercise into the working environment and atmosphere at S4C following a letter of complaint it received from BECTU on 28th April 2023. This letter followed an earlier e-mail of complaint from BECTU, dated 2nd December 2022, sent to the Chief Executive and the HR Director at S4C. The Authority engaged Capital Law to undertake an independent fact-finding exercise, and this is our Report on the evidence we gathered that can be made publicly available.

Capital Law is independent of S4C. We have not worked for them for at least 5 years and neither Capital Law, nor any of the people in Capital Law who worked on this Report, have provided legal advice to any of the individual members of the Authority, nor have they had any commercial or personal relationships with them.

Terms of Reference were agreed and are in Appendix 1.

Two lawyers were specifically tasked to undertake a fact-finding exercise – to listen and to report back what was heard. These investigators gathered evidence from members of staff, former members of staff, and people who previously worked with S4C who wanted to contribute to the process and share their comments about the working environment and the atmosphere inside it.

The Authority decided that those who gave evidence must be sure that they were doing so confidentially, with anonymity if they wanted that, and many did (so the investigators reported all the evidence anonymously). The investigator's Evidence Report, together with transcripts of what each witness said, were presented to S4C's Secretary and Chair and another team of Capital Law lawyers, who were to advise the Authority about it. The decisions to appoint both teams within Capital Law were made by the Authority on behalf of S4C.

Given the promise of confidentiality to the witnesses and the request of anonymity made by many, it has been challenging to provide this Report with sufficient clarity and supporting evidence. The Authority's non-executive directors have been given a comprehensive report on the evidence supported by extensive quotations from the witnesses, to enable them to make the decisions required of them, however we have had to paraphrase most of those quotations in this Report so that witnesses can't be identified, or that they don't have to worry that they might be identified.

We had to prioritise protecting the witnesses' identities, particularly as some of them reported being traumatised and nervous about giving evidence. We must therefore state clearly, for the avoidance of any doubt, that when we have been unable to quote from a witness, the evidence exists and has been seen by the Authority's members.

This Report, therefore, provides a distillation of the extensive evidence received. It cannot be the full record of all the evidence provided for the reasons given above.

Generally, reports such as this try to lay out the evidence anonymously to protect the privacy of those involved. Given the nature of this situation, and that the weight of the evidence was that the issues at S4C about its' working environment and atmosphere were caused by specific people, it was impossible not to name them. If we hadn't done so it would still have been obvious who was being discussed.

We were not required by the Terms of Reference to make recommendations about what the Authority should do because of the evidence we received, and we have not done so.

This Report only deals with the evidence provided to Capital Law up until the end of the fact-finding investigation. It does not deal with any matters raised since, whether in the media or in correspondence.

Introduction

Methodology to collect the evidence

The contributions received as part of the evidence-gathering process ('the Process') were completely voluntary. Most of the contributions were oral, with several written contributions. Additional documentary evidence was also collected from the participants.

95 individuals volunteered to take part in the Process but 3 changed their minds and didn't do so.

Of the 92 participants that took part in the Process:

- 46 of them were current employees at S4C,
- 14 of them were former employees of S4C,
- 28 were independent of S4C but had previously worked with S4C,
- 3 had left their Employment with S4C since the Process started, and
- 1 did not reveal their name.

Of the 92 participants, we met 79 and 13 provided written contributions only. Of the 79 participants with whom we met, 40 provided additional documentary evidence.

All meetings were audio recorded with permission of the witnesses and transcribed.

The investigators prepared for all meetings in accordance with the Terms of Reference, with questions prepared concerning the working environment and the atmosphere within S4C. All meetings proved to be different. Full consideration was given to all contributions, and effort was made to keep the meetings relevant to the Terms of Reference.

Having considered all the evidence, the investigators collated it by means of a summary of themes that emerged, supported by a selection of quotes from the transcripts and the written contributions. Of the 92 participants, 65 of them are quoted in the Evidence Report.

- Of the 92 participants, 63 asked to remain anonymous.
- As a result of the restrictions regarding confidentiality and the wishes of a majority of the participants to remain anonymous, responses to any specific allegations from participants were not invited.
- Given the sensitivity of the evidence and the number of individuals who requested to contribute anonymously, all the transcripts have been anonymised.
- 38 participants asked to meet us face to face. Those meetings were held in 4 different locations: Cardiff, Carmarthen, Aberystwyth, and Caernarfon. We met 41 of the participants virtually. We accepted 13 written contributions (without meetings).
- Throughout the Process, it became clear that many of the participants were making false assumptions that we were investigating allegations of bullying. Those participants were reminded that this was a listening/fact-finding process, not an investigation process of any specific claim.
- Very few participants commented about the period (or any event) before appointing Sian Doyle as Chief Executive of S4C. Most people came to share their comments, whether positive or negative, on the working environment at S4C since January 2022.

Structure of this Report

	<p>The overriding theme of the evidence we received was centred around the behaviours and actions of S4C's Chief Executive Officer, Sian Doyle and (but to a lesser extent) the Chief Content Officer, Llinos Griffin-Williams, how they went about their work and how it unsettled the organisation. This leads us to structure this Report as follows:</p>
<p>Chapter 1 The Chief Executive Officer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Overview — Implementing change — Use of critical and derogatory language — S4C Clic — Dictatorial leadership style — Confrontational behaviour — Shoot one and a thousand tremble — Ignoring experience and expertise — Disregarding and ignoring staff — Body language — Disrespectful behaviour — Staff duty of care — Supportive comments
<p>Chapter 2 The Chief Content Officer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Overview — Removing responsibilities — Regularly cancelling meetings — Lack of communication — The commissioners' relationship with external companies — The behaviours of the commissioners towards Llinos Griffin Williams
<p>Chapter 3 The effect on S4C as an organisation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Health and well-being — Disorganisation and disfunction
<p>Chapter 4 Teams affected</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Press and Marketing teams — Caernarfon office — The HR department
<p>Chapter 5 The Chairman</p>	

Chapter 1 – The Chief Executive

<p>Overview</p>	<p>Sian Doyle and her behaviour was a prominent theme brought up again and again. We received examples of her behaviour from former employees, third parties and current employees of each of the three S4C offices, from different levels within the organisation and from different departments. Considering the number of participants who commented, and the number of examples given, Sian Doyle's behaviour was highlighted as having the most significant negative impact on the working environment and atmosphere within S4C. This contains relevant examples.</p> <p>Most examples were of Sian Doyle's alleged bad behaviour (87.9%). Of those, 37 participants' (26 current employees and 11 former employees) view was that Sian Doyle's management style was confrontational, abusive and inconsiderate. Sian Doyle's behaviour was said to have had a significant impact on 18 current employees.</p> <p>Many of the examples provided were not proven by documentary evidence nor evidence from more than one witness, but there was a clear theme. Some of the evidence is of significant specific events whilst other evidence is of minor incidents, repeated creating a pattern. We report on both.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — We received 116 examples of Sian Doyle's behaviour, 101 of which have been categorised as alleged bad behaviour. There are 15 examples categorised as alleged good behaviour. — The 101 alleged examples of Sian Doyle's bad behaviour were provided by 29 participants. — Of the 29 participants who provided examples of Sian Doyle's alleged bad behaviour, 18 were current S4C employees, 9 were former S4C employees, and 2 had left the organisation since the start of the Process. — The 15 examples of Sian Doyle's alleged good behaviour have been provided by 12 participants. — Of the 15 examples of Sian Doyle's alleged good behaviour, 4 were from the participants that also provided examples of Sian Doyle's alleged bad behaviour. — Of the 12 participants who had provided examples of Sian Doyle's alleged good behaviour, 3 were former S4C employees and 9 were current S4C employees. — Of the 12 participants who had provided good examples of Sian Doyle's behaviour, 6 of them were appointed whilst she was Chief Executive. <p>16 pages of the Evidence Report quote examples of bad behaviour whilst 2 pages quote examples of good behaviour.</p>
<p>Implementing change</p>	<p>Although participants recognised that change is needed within S4C, and that the general strategic direction that Sian Doyle was working towards was a positive one, the participants described how Sian Doyle had failed to bring S4C colleagues with her in implementing and managing this change.</p> <p>The several reports from witnesses are summarised in these contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — It was reported that the Chief Executive had made it clear that to deliver change in the workplace, anxiety rather than trust was required and that they understood that the Chief Executive wanted staff to feel insecure at work to achieve this. — It was said that there was a: <i>"..culture of zero critical discourse and she has created a situation where there is no analysis of the truth, the truth gets presented in a way that Sian sees it and the management team do not challenge her because the culture has gone to such an extent that we do not have the right to challenge and in my opinion, to do the job we are supposed to do. I would describe the atmosphere as a type of 'compliance or die'."</i>

Chapter 1 – The Chief Executive

<p>Use of critical/derogatory language</p>	<p>Many of the participants described situations where they had seen Sian Doyle behave abusively whilst discussing S4C colleagues and their work. This was described in various ways, but participants referred to her targeting specific colleagues in public (outlined below) and her use of swear words and derogatory language whilst discussing them. This led to an unpleasant feeling of mistrust among participants.</p> <p>There are numerous reports of the Chief Executive being rude or disparaging about colleagues in internal meetings or in public. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Disparaging comments about S4C programmes and their presenters. In one example, in relation to a specific programme, the Chief Executive was reported as saying: <i>"who the fuck are [redacted - presenters]? Who is watching this rubbish?"</i> — <i>"Sian Doyle just started saying about [a former staff member] who no longer works at S4C. She was just wild and then said: "he has to go. I'm not going to have anyone like that working here". That is a paraphrase of her words. She was just telling a room full: "that's it. He has to go. I'm going to get rid of him."</i> — In one conversation about a colleague Sian Doyle was reported as saying: <i>'She's fucking gone, she shows me no respect. I'll get rid of her like that.'</i>
<p>S4c Clic</p>	<p>The participants described their feelings of frustration with the way Sian Doyle was publicly very critical about Clic twice: a management team meeting on 27/1/2022 and at a wider staff meeting on 28/4/2022, and there is a video of the latter and the comments made at it.</p> <p>We also received copies of SLACK messages between S4C staff members who were involved with Clic. Evidence that captures their comments immediately after the staff meeting on 28/4/2022. The evidence showed the adverse effect that Sian Doyle's comments had on the morale of the staff who had worked on Clic and the participants described their disappointment that these comments about Clic had been made publicly, rather than directly and privately to the individuals concerned in a professional manner.</p>
<p>Dictatorial Leadership style</p>	<p>Participants had reported that Sian Doyle's leadership style was: <i>"dictatorial creating a culture of fear"</i>. Many of the participants described the negative impact of this on them and their work, with many being reluctant to challenge the Chief Executive and afraid to state their own ideas or views to her. We were told that this caused many S4C staff to feel generally scared in the workplace.</p> <p>There are many reports of people considering that they had to do what the Chief Executive said, whether they agreed or not, with her saying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — <i>"are you with me or not, are you with me or not?"</i> and: <i>"It's me or the Chair, you have to choose who you are loyal to, me or the Chairman"?</i> — A participant reported that when attempting to provide feedback to the Chief Executive it was made clear that their opinion was neither welcomed nor valued.
<p>Confrontational behaviour</p>	<p>As well as many participants considering that Sian Doyle's leadership was <i>"dictatorial"</i>, we heard from many people who considered her to be confrontational.</p> <p>There were a number of examples of this, but providing details and quotations in this section, in particular, might breach the confidentiality of the witnesses. Several reports suggest individuals were berated in meetings with many other staff present but the evidence is very personal.</p> <p>At least one incident was described where upsetting behaviour and challenging body</p>

Chapter 1 – The Chief Executive

	<p>language resulted in a staff member being in tears and needing to be comforted by others present.</p>
"Shoot one and a thousand tremble"	<p>An example of Sian Doyle's leadership style was her alleged regular use of the phrase "Shoot one and a thousand tremble". This was raised by many participants and witnessed first-hand by 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — <i>Investigator: "Have you heard Sian say [shoot one and a thousand tremble]?"</i> <i>[Redacted]: "Yes, and the entire management team has heard Sian say this several times."</i>
Ignoring experience and expertise	<p>We heard that participants felt that Sian Doyle disregarded experience, expertise and past successes. One witness said:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — <i>"I've worked under 5 chief executives, a good relationship, a number of chairmen, with an interim Chief Executive and I have never felt so worthless as I was working for Siân."</i>
Disregarding and ignoring staff	<p>Witnesses said how they were ignored and/or avoided by Sian Doyle at work and at work events, and this quote captures the evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — A staff member said: <i>"Nothing was said to me. No thank you. Nothing. Nothing."</i> They further described a challenging environment where they felt persistently ignored by the Chief Executive during conversations with key stakeholders which led to another manager apologising for the behaviour of the Chief Executive.
Body language	<p>Witnesses spoke of frustration with how Sian Doyle conducted herself during meetings, either ignoring people or using negative body language, such as rolling her eyes, to cast disdain.</p> <p>This evidence is encapsulated by this quote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — <i>"So, for months this conversation went on and every time we did it, there was a period for three, four months where I don't think I finished one sentence because the moment I started talking in any meeting, she would interrupt, she would look sarky. If I was making a point that she disagreed with she would roll her eyes at me and at other people around the table in quite a public way in order to try to undermine the point I was doing."</i>
Disrespectful behaviour	<p>Witnesses described occasions where they considered Sian Doyle's behaviour to be disrespectful towards S4C colleagues and of the work of S4C staff.</p> <p>For example, one witness spoke of speaking with the Chief Executive at an event about a new programme which had been well received but which the Chief Executive chose to belittle publicly.</p> <p>Another illustration was provided by a participant who reported that Sian Doyle said forcefully, when being offered advice and a briefing: <i>"Who is the Chief Executive?"</i>, giving the impression that the advice and briefing didn't count and that only the Chief Executive's opinion counted.</p>
Staff duty of care	<p>On two separate occasions, it was alleged that Sian Doyle had asked colleagues about their sickness / health absence in front of other colleagues.</p> <p>An example of this is the Chief Executive asking a colleague to join her in a public</p>

Chapter 1 – The Chief Executive

	discussion with others then asking her about a specific private health issue.
Supportive	<p>We heard from several participants that they consider Sian Doyle to be supportive, with work issues and personal issues that they had faced. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — <i>"Siân, the Chief Executive, always makes a point of saying hello, and making sure I'm okay."</i> — <i>"She's supportive, she's flexible, she's easy going but I know where I stand too."</i> — <i>"- the Chief Executive sorry - has been very supportive of me over the years they have been in the role. I believe they have been very ambitious, and the channel's visibility has been global since they started, and they have been a lot of help to me."</i>
	<p>Further evidence of challenging behaviour from the Chief Executive is included in Chapter 3 and 4 of this Report.</p>

Chapter 2 – The Chief Content Officer

<p>Overview</p>	<p>The Chief Content Officer came in for criticism for how she dealt with the S4C commissioners, a key layer of experience and influence within the organisation. They share significant responsibility for S4C's content, and they have influence over the implementation of the organisation's strategic objectives. We heard from a range of people, both working within and outside S4C, who were unhappy about and critical of the working environment and the atmosphere at S4C, such that it had a negative effect on the commissioners and, thereby, on the output of the organisation.</p>
<p>Removing responsibilities</p>	<p>Five Commissioners expressed frustration that decisions and responsibilities had been taken away from them and centralised in the hands of Llinos Griffin Williams who, in their opinion, micromanaged whilst being unable to make decisions promptly. The participants also said that many decisions were made by Llinos Griffin Williams without their input. This had a wider paralysing effect.</p> <p>Examples included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — <i>"From the very beginning, Llinos Griffin Williams was discussing with companies before chatting with us as commissioners e.g. a [redacted - producer] told me that Llinos Griffin Williams wants to appoint more people for the commissioning team as an additional resource. It's unbelievable that Llinos Griffin Williams had not discussed this with us."</i> — <i>"Everything went through Llinos, which is fine because she is in her job, but if you're going to do that you have to be available. If you want to micromanage that, you have to be available because things just come to stop. Small things like deciding who is allowed to appear, or if I ask for advice in an email, you have to come in, and then when I have signed off a program, she came in and changed it and said I want to see this and then made changes, just undermining my editorial eyes..."</i> — A participant reported a clear pattern of lack of internal communication with commissioners and described an example where a proposition for a series had been shared with the independent production sector but not communicated with the internal colleagues responsible for that area of work.
<p>Regularly cancelling one to one meetings</p>	<p>Three Commissioners expressed their frustrations that, after the appointment of Llinos Griffin Williams there was an environment of disorganised work, with meetings repeatedly cancelled. They said that they relied on those meetings to share ideas and confirm plans. The commissioners explained that the cancellation of such meetings created instability and contributed to bad feelings between them and Llinos Griffin Williams.</p> <p>An example is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — <i>"121 meeting gets cancelled all the time. Normally we would get 121's every two weeks with the Head of Content. Since Llinos Griffin Williams came these meetings are very rare things. This leads to a delay before being able to answer production companies which often means that many companies are angry and frustrated."</i>
<p>Poor communication</p>	<p>Two commissioners said there was a lack of communication about important decisions. Specific examples were provided, such as convening a group meeting at short notice unexpectedly involving the head of HR (perceived as ominous), only later to learn (after asking) that it was to discuss a significant restructuring within the commissioning team.</p>

Chapter 2 – The Chief Content Officer

<p>The Commissioners' relationship with external companies</p>	<p>We heard from 5 participants from external companies that they knew of the breakdown in the relationship between the Chief Content Officer and the commissioners and that there was growing concern about the effect of her approach on the commissioning department. This led to disfunction and miscommunication in the sector as rumours circulated about what the CCO wanted commissioned, with the commissioners believing that they didn't know what was going on such that they had to ask independent producers what they knew about what the CCO was up to.</p>
<p>The approach of the commissioners towards Llinos Griffin Williams</p>	<p>Both present and former employees of S4C, and some external witnesses, talked of the breakdown in the relationship between the commissioners and the Chief Content Officer leading to them being negative and hostile towards her.</p> <p>A participant reported that a Commissioner had reacted negatively to the appointment of the Chief Content Officer and raised their voice while challenging her expertise.</p>
	<p>Further evidence of challenging behaviour from the Chief Content Officer is included in the Chapter 3 and 4.</p>

Chapter 3 – The effect on S4C as an organisation

<p>Health and well-being Overview</p>	<p>During the Process, the welfare of some of the participants became a concern, because they were clearly uncomfortable and/or upset and some broke down during our meetings with them, especially while detailing their feelings about the work environment and the atmosphere within S4C.</p> <p>In addition, we heard about a serious incident at an S4C management team meeting in Llangrannog between 21/2/2023-22/2/2023, at which one employee suffered a significant health event.</p>
<p>The general well-being of the participants</p>	<p>During our meetings, 10 of the participants broke down crying, mostly while discussing their experiences in the S4C workplace.</p> <p>11 participants reported on the detrimental effects that they considered the work environment at S4C had on their health.</p> <p>Examples included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>"I left because I didn't feel for any reason that I had a choice but to leave the cause of the situation. The Chief Executive had put me in a very nasty position, many other staff too, I was aware of that. But my friends and my family worried a lot about my mental health at the time. I had become very tearful. I couldn't sleep. And the atmosphere at work during the last few months of employment at S4C were very difficult and I didn't feel like I had a choice but to leave."</i> 2. One participant described how the: <i>"atmosphere had changed completely"</i> following the appointment of the Chief Executive. They felt that the <i>"impossible work requirements"</i> and the subsequent pressure contributed to them being unable to work due to depression and anxiety.
<p>Management Team Away Day – 22/2/2023</p>	<p>Between 21/2/2023 and 22/2/2023 the management team met at an away day where an employee suffered a significant health event.</p> <p>This incident was raised by 18 participants of which 5 had been present, 13 having heard of it by word of mouth.</p> <p>To protect the confidentiality of the individual, and because of her medical condition even though she didn't ask for anonymity, we have significantly summarised the evidence.</p> <p>The employee described an animated conversation involving the Chief Executive and other senior staff members about the level of change that was required at S4C. This included replacing many staff who were described as: <i>"not worth worrying about"</i> and that the Chief Executive suggested a lot of the staff at S4C did not have the skills or knowledge to be able to justify being in their jobs. She described potentially losing: <i>"at least 50 of them"</i>.</p> <p>The witness said she was distressed and challenged the Chief Executive about what she was suggesting. She described how she believed that the stressful situation then contributed to the significant health event she suffered that day, for which she was taken to hospital to receive treatment.</p> <p>The other 4 direct witnesses who were close to the leading of the event, three members of the senior management team and the facilitator, didn't consider the meeting to be abnormal.</p>
<p>Disorganisation, dissatisfaction and disfunction</p>	<p>Many participants expressed significant dissatisfaction with the working environment and the atmosphere at S4C, and, very often, their reasons for feeling dissatisfied are based on examples of alleged behaviour by Sian Doyle and/or Llinos Griffin Williams. However, it became clear to us that the feelings of some participants</p>

Chapter 3 – The effect on S4C as an organisation

were based on stories or gossip from colleagues and that they did not witness these events themselves. It can be seen from the evidence, therefore, that the spread of stories, especially about Sian Doyle and Llinos Griffin Williams, contributed negatively to the working environment and the atmosphere in S4C causing disorganisation, dissatisfaction and disfunction.

Second Hand Evidence

During the Process, 19 participants commented on alleged bad behaviour by Sian Doyle and Llinos Griffin Williams, not based on what they had seen, but rather, based on what they had heard second-hand from other members of staff.

The evidence includes:

- The *"Shoot one and a thousand tremble"* comment by the Chief Executive Officer, reported first hand too.
- The management away day incident.
- Comments made by Sian Doyle about a former staff member to: *"get rid of him"*.
- Micromanaging by Sian Doyle and Llinos Griffin Williams.
- The virtual staff meeting on 12th December 2022. One witness described an exchange between an individual and Sian Doyle where she was rude to a colleague who asked a question, and the colleague was later referred to HR for doing so.
- An event was held for S4C staff at Boom Battle Bar in Cardiff on 19th April 2023, where it was alleged that Llinos Griffin Williams called S4C staff: *"twats"* and blew smoke in a colleague's face.

Disorganisation

Many participants spoke of the lack of order within S4C and the way this disorganisation had a detrimental effect on the working environment and atmosphere. The examples given to us by different participants were varied and often unrelated to each other, but the effect on the participants was similar and they spoke about frustration and reduced productivity. Here are two examples:

- *"I'm lost and I have no idea what's going on in terms of what's getting commissioned and what is the discussion around that."*
- *"The biggest issue I think, again with them, is a point I made earlier, and one of the points I wanted to discuss is was just how many meetings [redacted] and [redacted] cancel weekly. That is, to give you an idea. I've spied on the history of the last four/ five weeks and there have been 17 meetings cancelled by [redacted] and [redacted]. Weekly now, and that's 3 ½ meetings a week cancelled."*

Chapter 4 – Specific teams

<p>Introduction</p>	<p>Negative comments were made about three teams or divisions in S4C: the Caernarfon office, the Press and Marketing teams and the HR department. To some extent or another they have all been impacted by the disorganisation, dissatisfaction and disfunction that we report at S4C.</p> <p>We've reported on the impact of the events in this Report on the health and well-being of many at S4C and, with that in mind, that people involved in those teams will remain employed and colleagues, we have not provided quotations or paraphrasing of the evidence about them.</p> <p>The evidence received about these teams was not confined to those who worked within them, but also the wider workforce.</p>
<p>Press and Marketing teams</p>	<p>Participants raised issues regarding the performance of the team and some raised concerns over micromangement.</p> <p>We heard that the Press and Marketing teams have faced significant changes throughout 2022 which naturally affected their work environment and the atmosphere in S4C.</p> <p>Participants described the additional workload experienced after the departure of several team members. Several were dissatisfied with the time it took to fill vacancies, which led to intensified work pressure and contributed to a feeling of a lack of direction. Whilst others said that the added pressure had a detrimental effect on their health.</p> <p>Despite the impact of this on the Press and Marketing teams, we heard that a few recent appointments have been made in key roles and it was said that this has eased their pressure of work.</p> <p>In summary, a negative working environment across the Press and Marketing teams was reported by several participants with a lack of support being a consistent theme. The teams have been through considerable change and a challenging time from which it needs to rebuild.</p>
<p>Caernarfon office</p>	<p>Although the S4C office in Caernarfon is the workplace for a cross-section of employees and members of various teams across the organisation, the contribution from individuals who work there was striking. Several staff members based in Caernarfon gave evidence and the tenor of their contribution was consistent.</p> <p>There was a widespread feeling that the Caernarfon office was an unhappy and negative workplace, feeling isolated from the rest of the organisation and that there was a lack of support for those working there.</p>
<p>Human Resources department</p>	<p>We heard from many witnesses that they were dissatisfied with the working environment and the atmosphere within S4C, but despite this, there was a reluctance from many to share their feelings and discuss them with S4C's HR department particularly if the issues were in relation to senior management.</p> <p>A number felt it was a challenge to raise things internally, and some had particular concerns in raising issues if they were in relation to the senior management.</p> <p>There was evidence of a disconnect between the HR department and the wider workforce, with some concerned that staff were reluctant to trust the department to act on concerns or keep issues confidential and that the HR team was perceived by some as being too close to the Chief Executive and the senior management team.</p> <p>There did, though, seem to be a misunderstanding by some of the witnesses</p>

Chapter 4 – Specific teams

about the role of HR. Whilst HR departments facilitate support to employees, they must also work closely with management teams and senior individuals. But a HR department must be believed by the members of organisation to perform these roles even-handedly and to maintain the right balance between them.

Chapter 5 – The Chairman

	<p>Some individuals raised concerns about Rhodri Williams and alleged he intensified the pressure on some, by negatively affecting the working atmosphere and environment within S4C for them.</p> <p>Whilst some of these concerns relate to the Chairman personally, others could be described as directed at the Authority and some of its decisions.</p>
<p>Issue already dealt with and resolved</p>	<p>One witness expressed concern about Rhodri Williams' behaviour during a meeting between the Non-Executive Members of the Board and the Management Team on 15/6/2023, after a letter from BECTU and after our investigation started, which was witnessed by others. This issue relates to a grievance raised by Llinos Griffin Williams about the Chairman's behaviour. This was subject to a separate process and investigation, distinct from this fact-finding investigation, which concluded soon after the allegation was raised.</p>
<p>Issues raised during the Process</p>	<p>One witness alleged that the Chair raised his voice on a telephone call and also alleged that he repeatedly "berated" them for not making progress in removing a staff member.</p> <p>Another witness said that the Chair knew of the issues in the workplace at S4C before the BECTU letter was received and had therefore been misleading in a media interview in May, but this interview was widely reported and this is an isolated view.</p>
<p>Issues raised in relation to the Process</p>	<p>Whilst some of these concerns set out in this section relate to the Chairman personally, others could be described as directed at the Authority and some of its decisions.</p> <p>One witness disliked the Chairman dealing with the media about the investigation before or at the same time as staff were finding out what was going on. They said:</p> <p><i>"The Chair's internal decision to characterise the nature of the complaints of BECTU's letter as not making comfortable reading, if true would cause us worry, and not the kind of things that any one responsible for any kind of body would like to read, were unwise, and no specialist body would advise making such statements publicly in such circumstances."</i></p> <p>This was a feeling echoed by 5 witnesses who felt that the BECTU letter should have been handled more delicately. One said:</p> <p><i>"It's just the way the letter from the union.... just exploded in the news and so on. I'm not a member of the union so I didn't know anything about it. It came as a shock to me. We didn't know... an email came after hours work from the Chairman; I believe. I saw it but there were a lot from the office that hadn't seen it, just seen the story on the news."</i></p> <p>This theme continued with four witnesses speaking in one way or another about the way the Chair had taken charge of communications throughout this period and what he said. One believed he had been briefing the media behind the scenes and that this had made the situation worse. One said:</p> <p><i>"The Chair has repeatedly gone out and briefed the press without letting us know and we've had to read in the press what he said about this. ... even though we have a comms specialist, we asked for crisis comms to be brought in, he put himself in charge of all the communication, which again is something that I've never experienced in any other organisation."</i></p> <p>Two witnesses felt that insufficient regard was had to the impact of the investigation on their health, one of which said that this was brought directly to the attention of the board. They also felt that they should have been provided with legal support during the process.</p>

Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for a Fact-Finding Process by Capital Law on the working environment and atmosphere within S4C

1. Commissioning Officer

- i. Rhodri Williams is the Commissioner of this process and Geraint Pugh, Secretary of the S4C Board, will be principal liaison for the Leader.
- ii. The Commissioner has appointed [redacted], a Partner at Capital Law, who is completely external and independent of S4C, and has agreed these Terms of Reference.

2. Process Leader

- i. [redacted] will lead the process (the Leader). [redacted], Solicitor at Capital Law, will support the Leader throughout the process and an individual will also attend each meeting to take notes.
- ii. [redacted] and [redacted] can confirm that they have no prior knowledge of the matters to be investigated and that there are no known conflicts of interests.
- iii. The Leader's primary role is to meet any member of staff (including former members of staff or individuals who have previously worked with S4C) who wish to contribute to the process and share their comments about the working environment and atmosphere within S4C, and then to present their findings to Non-Executive Members of the S4C Board. The Leader will remain completely objective throughout the process.

3. The Process

- i. The Leader will create an email address (S4C@capitallaw.co.uk) so that S4C staff can get in touch to book an appointment to meet them. S4C will refer any member of staff who wishes to contribute to the process to contact the Leader in that way.
- ii. S4C will provide the Leader with a list of its staff members so that he can verify if an individual is eligible to contribute to the process, as a current member of staff, former member of staff or individuals who have previously worked with S4C. While there is no restriction on the date when a former member of staff left S4C's employment, the Commissioner is requesting that the Leader considers the relevance of comments by an individual to what is claimed to be happening currently and recently within S4C. To verify a former member of staff or individual who has previously worked for S4C, after the deadline has been made for individuals to book appointments (see clause 3iii. below), the Leader will ask the Commissioner to provide a list of staff over the period commencing with the earlier month an individual left/worked with S4C to a deadline.
- iii. In the first instance, staff members will be able to contact the Leader until 19 May 2023 to book an appointment.
- iv. Before initiating meetings with staff, so that they can understand more about the context of the process, the Commissioner encourages the Leader to meet with:
 - a. Carwyn Donovan, BECTU,
 - b. S4C's Human Resources Director.
- v. In addition to any relevant documents the Commissioner discloses to the Leader, the Commissioner will disclose any other documents the Leader believes are relevant for him to consider during the process.
- vi. The Leader will arrange meetings with any eligible member of staff as soon as practicable. The meetings will be organised either in person, over Teams/ Zoom or over the phone, whichever is best for each person. The Commissioner anticipates that some members of staff will want to contribute to the process but would not want to meet with the Leader. In that case the Leader will receive

Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference

comments/contributions in writing from these individuals. Individuals may be accompanied by either a colleague or union representative at meetings with the Leader.

- vii. The Commissioner and Leader acknowledge they cannot give a timetable for when the meetings with staff will be completed because that depends entirely on how many individuals contribute to the process.
- viii. The Commissioner and Leader acknowledge that more members of staff may come forward later than the 19 May 2023 wishing to contribute to the process. The Leader will notify the Commissioner if that happens (without naming the individuals) and the Commissioner will confirm if he is ready for the Leader to arrange more meetings.
- ix. During the process, if the Leader considers it would be beneficial for him to meet any member of staff who has not already come forward, the Commissioner will agree to help arrange meetings with the relevant members of staff recognising neither the Commissioner nor the Leader can compel anyone to meet with or contribute to the Leader.
- x. The Leader will ask the individuals contributing to the process if they wish to be named in the report or remain anonymous. Without the consent of the individual, the Leader will not disclose to S4C who has come forward to contribute to the process, whether by meeting or in writing.
- xi. After meeting with staff members, the Leader will prepare a report laying out the facts and evidence obtained throughout the process. The Leader will only send the full report to the Commissioner and Geraint Pugh. The Leader will also prepare a summary of his findings so that this can be shared with the non-executive members of the Board. The Leader will also prepare a high-level summary of his findings on the understanding that this summary may be made public. The Leader understands that his full report is not to be shared with any other non-executive members of the Board, other than the Commissioner, as they may have to participate in internal processes following this process, if appropriate.
- xii. The Leader is not to reach decisions on any allegations arising through the process, but to state the facts and evidence gathered through the process.

4. Timetable

- i. The Leader will start the process as soon as possible but there will be no time limit on the process to ensure there is no limit on the number of staff members who can contribute. The Leader intends to submit his report as soon as possible after interviewing staff members but that period will depend on the number of staff who come forward.