

20210206-C2055716_McGowan_PHSO

Rob Behrens

06 February 2021

Oliver McGowan C2055716 – Dr Kirkup review - complaints views

References:

- A. 20210129-Letter from Rob Behrens to Mr and Mrs McGowan.
- B. Review by Dr Bill Kirkup - PHSO handling of the complaint about Oliver's care.
- C. 20200922-C2055716_McGowan_PHSO.

1. We are writing in response to your letter at Reference A and your request for our *'frank views in writing'* to the review by Dr Bill Kirkup at Reference B. The following comments are for your consideration and have been aligned to paragraph numbers in the review for your ease of your cross-reference:

- **Para 2.2 (Review Process): The complainants were not interviewed, nor anyone associated with local LeDer review or the DHSC review.**

Comment: This is a missed opportunity and amounts to a fundamental failure of Dr Kirkup's review. We were never asked to be interviewed, in fact, we were only made aware that a review was being conducted by Dr Kirup when we contacted the PHSO for an update on a response to our letter at Reference C in December 2020. Dr Kirkup's review is a one sided (PHSO) view of the events and is focussed on the PHSO 'current' process rather than highlighting where these processes are not fit-for-purpose. One of the main reasons we lost total confidence in the PHSO process was due to our lack of involvement in the questions and pen picture summary of events being supplied to the independent advisors. These artifacts contained fundamental errors that led the independent advisors to make flawed determinations. In a similar vein, Dr Kirkup's review and the lack of engagement with us (the complainants) directly makes his review also one-sided.

- **Para 4.1 (Theme 2): Oliver's parents preferred to communicate about the PHSO investigation by email alone.**

Comment: INCORRECT, initially we had regular verbal comms; however, the majority of these comms were to inform us there was no update! Our request for email comms was only if there were no updates or information to discuss. We never stated we did not want to speak to PHSO or any of the independent advisors, on the contrary, we would have welcomed the opportunity to discuss our complaint with the independent advisers. A point we raised in our letter at Reference C, Recommendation 2, Comment: (extract for ease of reference):

'We believe this was an opportunity missed. Our recent experience of the LeDeR Independent Review demonstrated real value for the independent advisers speaking to us to get our perspective of the events rather than just using hospital notes.'

- **Para 6.1 (Theme 4): ...Oliver's parents had significant reservations about...clinical records, there was no opportunity to discuss this in greater detail with them...**

Comment: INCORRECT, we never refused a request to discuss Oliver's case with the PHSO, on the contrary, we would have welcomed the opportunity to expand on our issues with the clinical notes or any other aspect of our complaint. The PHSO never requested a conversation regarding our issues with the clinical notes. Our position about the accuracy of the clinical notes was supported by the DHSC LeDeR report and was highlighted in our letter to you at Reference C, Recommendation 2, Comment: (extract for ease of reference):

'...LeDeR has commented on the poor quality of the hospital notes.'

2. It is our opinion that Dr Kirup's review presents a one-sided (PHSO) version of events only with little regard for our complaint or the truth. Dr Kirkup did not speak to us, nor ask to speak to us. His one-sided review only adds to our lack of trust in the PHSO service and processes.

3. Therefore, we have no desire for any further communication (written or verbal) with the PHSO / PHSO service. It is our conclusion that the PHSO exists to give the impression that it provides redress; however, it is fundamentally flawed, not impartial and defensive of its processes and reputation.

4. This **will be** our final communication (written or verbal) with the PHSO / PHSO Service. To be clear, these views are from our experience over a 4-year-period of the PHSO / PHSO Service and can be published. We now hope that you and your staff will take the time to reflect on these and our earlier points and give full consideration to the DHSC LeDeR recommendations (provided to you earlier) in future complaints.

Regards

Mr Thomas McGowan
Mrs Paula McGowan

Copied

Dr Bill Kirkup
Mr Dan Scorer
Amanda Harrington
Diedre Mickletwaite
Abi Howarth