

# Whistleblowing Policy



**Drafted by:** Alastair Heath-Robinson

**Version Number:** V1.2

The Trustees of Orwell Multi Academy Trust adopted this policy on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2024 following consultation with staff and school representatives of the recognised unions.

**Review Date:** Biannual

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Alastair Heath-Robinson", is written over a faint, light-colored signature line.

**Signed** Date: 15<sup>th</sup> October 2024

**Chair of Trustees**

**Trust Address:** 64 Prince of Wales Drive  
Ipswich  
IP2 8PY

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	3
1.1 Liability .....	3
2. Scope .....	4
3. Purpose of the procedure.....	4
4. Definitions and exclusions .....	4
4.4 Other relevant guidance and procedures .....	6
5. Procedure for making a disclosure .....	6
5.1 Lines of reporting .....	6
5.2 For school-based staff .....	7
5.3 For shared services team staff .....	7
5.4 Process of disclosing .....	7
6. Responding to a disclosure .....	8
7. Safeguards for whistle-blowers (see also section 4.3) .....	9
7.1 Internal procedures .....	9
7.2 Other protections .....	9
8. Improper disclosures .....	9
9. Contacts and How the matter can be taken further .....	10

## 1. Introduction

Orwell Multi Academy Trust (OMAT) is committed to honesty and integrity and expects all staff to act in a manner which reflects this commitment. The Trust has a responsibility to ensure that its schools are managed to the highest standards of probity, and that decision making and administration is conducted in such a way as to be above any suspicion of malpractice.

Clear policies, standards and procedures for making decisions, particularly those which entail significant expenditure, or decisions which significantly affect employment at the school are essential elements in creating and sustaining an atmosphere of openness and trust in school management. Such an atmosphere is the best way of forestalling suspicion or complaint.

Staff who raise concerns about malpractice within their place of work have statutory protection against victimisation for making such a disclosure, under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, and the subsequent Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act, which was enacted in June 2013. The worker must reasonably believe the disclosure to be in the public interest, and it must otherwise qualify as a protected act (see section 4 for more detail on the criteria.) This policy is non-contractual.

### 1.1 Liability

Employers are now liable for any detriment a whistle-blower suffers as a result of having made a disclosure, if the detriment was done by another worker in the course of employment (even if was without the employer's knowledge), or by an agent of the employer (with the employer's authority). This is balanced by the new ability for an employer to defend itself by showing that it took all reasonable steps to prevent the detriment from occurring. This includes having a policy on whistleblowing, ensuring staff are aware of it, and that it is followed when cases arise.

Individuals can also be found legally liable for detriment they caused a whistle-blower, unless they can show they have acted in response to a statement from the employer, which it was reasonable to rely upon.

### 1.2 What is the benefit of having a policy on whistleblowing?

OMAT is committed to promoting and maintaining the highest standards in the management and administration of its affairs. Local Governing Committees of all schools should follow this procedure and make all staff under their control aware of it.

Adopting a whistleblowing procedure is essential to the principles of accountability, transparency and probity, which underpin good governance.

By the adoption and publication of this procedure OMAT may demonstrate its commitment to high standards of conduct in its affairs and establish a basis on which any worker can properly raise concerns without prejudice to their personal position.

## 2. Scope

This procedure applies to all teaching and support staff in OMAT schools.

An employee working within a school but employed on another organisation's terms and conditions of employment should have the matter managed under their appropriate policy/procedure.

## 3. Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this procedure is to encourage any worker who has a concern that practices in their school do not meet the required standards of probity to raise that concern at an appropriate level and in an appropriate manner.

This procedure is also intended to guide any worker who has a disclosure to make about malpractice in their school in making that disclosure. It sets out to whom malpractice (or suspected malpractice) should be reported, and how it should be reported.

The procedure also sets out the safeguards that the school and the Trust will offer to any worker who makes a disclosure in the recommended way.

## 4. Definitions and exclusions

### 4.1 Who do the protections apply to?

Whistle-blowers do not need a qualifying period of service to bring a claim of unfair dismissal: in other words, staff are protected as soon as they join the organisation. Tribunals are also not restricted by the usual upper limit on compensation. These two facts can mean that sometimes whistleblowing claims are used tactically.

Protection is afforded to workers as well as employees; this includes staff on casual contracts, freelance workers, seconded workers, trainees and agency workers.

Protection from detriment also applies to ex-employees making disclosures after the termination of their employment.

Furthermore, the Government has indicated the protections may be extended to job applicants, which will prevent organisations from blacklisting applicants because they have made protected disclosures against previous employers. This is dependent upon the outcome of a Call for Evidence by the Government.

### 4.2 What should a concern be about, in terms of the criteria for qualifying disclosures?

The term "malpractice" may cover a broad range of acts, omissions, or practices. Workers will usually report specific instance(s) of wrongdoing by individual(s). In certain circumstances, workers may report bad practice which, if it were to continue, would be likely to lead to wrongdoing.

The Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998 and Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 protect workers who make qualifying disclosures from any detriment as a result of making a disclosure.

A qualifying disclosure must relate to:

- a criminal offence;

- a failure to comply with any legal obligation;
- a miscarriage of justice;
- a Health & Safety risk
- misuse of public money
- corruption or unethical conduct
- abuse of pupils, students or other users
- damage to the environment;
- an attempt to cover up any of these
- any other substantial and relevant concern.

In a school, concerns may often (but by no means always) centre upon appropriate use of funds. For instance, the following would normally be an inappropriate use of budget:

- disregard of proper tendering procedure for contracts;
- manipulation or falsification of accounting records;
- making decisions for personal gain;
- inappropriate (e.g. private) use of school assets

Other, non-financial, concerns may include inappropriate use of school premises or inappropriate professional relationships which potentially affect the good management of the school.

The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act introduces the need for disclosures to be “in the public interest”, removing the need for them to have been made in good faith. However, as there is no legal definition of “public interest”, it will remain to be decided in individual cases. Disclosures relating to the worker’s own contract will usually fall outside of whistleblowing, and should instead be followed up via grievance procedures.

If a tribunal believes a successful disclosure was made in bad faith, compensation can be reduced by up to 25%. In practice this means workers may now bring claims maliciously or for personal gain but still be protected, if they are able to meet the public interest criteria.

To be afforded protection, workers must also raise their concerns in the proper way (see section 5 for specific guidance for schools on process). Usually, in the first instance, this should be via internal processes. In certain cases the Act also protects disclosure to “prescribed regulators” such as the Audit Commission.

The Act only protects wider disclosure (e.g., to the media, an MP, etc.) if:

- the worker reasonably believed they would be victimised if they had raised the matter internally or with a prescribed regulator;
- there was no prescribed regulator and they reasonably believed the evidence would be concealed;
- the concern had already been raised with the employer or prescribed regulator;

- the concern was exceptionally serious;
- and no payment was accepted for the story.

#### **4.3 What kinds of detriment are workers protected from?**

The kinds of detriment that could be suffered by whistle-blowers will depend on whether they are job applicants, existing members of staff, or ex-members of staff. Some examples of detriment linked to a protected disclosure are:

- harassment and bullying,
- inappropriate disciplinary action,
- loss of work or pay,
- damage to career prospects,
- providing poor references,
- defamation,
- inappropriately referring them to external organisations for audit or scrutiny,
- not considering them for a role if they re-apply,
- dismissal or selection for redundancy because of making a qualifying disclosure.

#### **4.4 Other relevant guidance and procedures**

The Whistleblowing policy is not intended to substitute for other procedures. Complaints by workers about their personal treatment or the way in which employment policies and practices have been applied to them should be raised via the grievance procedure or other appropriate procedure. Complaints about the protection of children should normally be raised under the separate procedures designated for that purpose, unless those procedures have not been sufficiently enacted.

### **5. Procedure for making a disclosure**

The means of making a disclosure will depend to some extent on the nature and seriousness of the concern, the sensitivity of the issues and the individual(s) thought to be involved in the malpractice reported.

#### **5.1 Lines of reporting**

As a general rule, a worker wishing to make a disclosure should raise the concerns in the first instance with their Headteacher or the Chair of the local governing committee (LGC). This is appropriate where the concern is about the conduct or practice of colleagues: a concern that the school's policies and procedures are not being properly or fairly applied. This enables the issue to be addressed at school level. Shared services team staff should raise the concerns in the first instance with their line manager, CEO or the Chair of the Trust Board.

## **5.2 For school-based staff**

Where a worker wishing to make a disclosure (the “whistle-blower”) believes that they cannot approach the Headteacher or the Chair of LGC, the concern should be raised with the CEO or Chair of the Trust Board. This will be appropriate if the disclosure concerns the conduct of the Headteacher or the LGC, or if a disclosure has already been made to them and no discernible or timely action has been taken to address the situation.

If the whistle-blower reasonably believes that CEO themselves is implicated or wish to make a disclosure regarding the CEO, they should report the matter to the Chair of the Trust Board. Ultimately, if they feel the Chair of the Trust Board themselves are implicated or they wish to make a disclosure regarding the Chair of the Trust Board, they should report the matter to the confidential telephone hotline and/or the ESFA/DFE detailed on page 11

## **5.3 For shared services team staff**

Where a worker wishing to make a disclosure (the “whistle-blower”) believes that they cannot approach their line manager, the concern should be raised with the CEO or Chair of the Trust Board. This will be appropriate if the disclosure concerns the conduct of the line manager, or if a disclosure has already been made to them and no discernible or timely action has been taken to address the situation.

If the whistle-blower reasonably believes that CEO themselves is implicated or wish to make a disclosure regarding the CEO, they should report the matter to the Chair of the Trust Board. Ultimately, if they feel the Chair of the Trust Board themselves are implicated or they wish to make a disclosure regarding the Chair of the Trust Board, they should report the matter to the confidential telephone hotline and/or the ESFA/DFE detailed on page 11

## **5.4 Process of disclosing**

A disclosure may be made verbally (e.g. by telephone) or in writing. The whistle-blower should normally identify him/herself and should make it clear that they is making a disclosure within the terms of this procedure.

A whistle-blower raising a concern verbally will normally be expected to support and substantiate those concerns in writing, unless there are special circumstances indicating that this is inappropriate. If the whistle-blower feels unable to commit their concerns to writing they will normally be asked to meet with an appropriate senior member of staff, who will compile a written note of the disclosure.

The whistle-blower may be accompanied by a trade union representative or appropriate workplace colleague at meetings that are held for the purpose of formally discussing or investigating the disclosure.

It is not necessary for a whistle-blower to produce conclusive evidence to support his/her disclosure. Suspicion may be valid grounds for raising a concern. However, the whistle-blower should normally have direct information about, or knowledge of, the malpractice alleged, or know where such evidence is located. The whistle-blower's concern should be based on more than hearsay, gossip, or the reports of others. The disclosure should usually include specific examples of unacceptable behaviour.

Disclosures should not be made to the press, radio, television or other media including social media. The recommended internal reporting channels should be used. Workers have certain rights to report malpractice to specified external agencies, e.g. a worker who suspects that a criminal act has been committed may inform the police. However, it is expected that whistle-blowers make disclosures following the reporting lines set out above.

## **6. Responding to a disclosure**

The response to a whistle-blower's disclosure will depend on a number of factors such as the seriousness and complexity of the allegations made.

Allegations may be:

- investigated within the school or, shared services team
- referred to the internal or external auditors
- referred to the police;
- referred to another independent form of enquiry;
- or any combination of the above.

The school or shared services team may wish to consider using external independent investigators, though this will in part depend on the complexity of the case.

Disclosures will be subject to initial enquiries in order to decide whether a full investigation is necessary and, if so, what form it should take, who should conduct it, and whether any reference to another agency is necessary or desirable. Some concerns may be resolved through agreed action without the need for further investigation.

If the whistle-blower's concern falls within the scope of an alternative procedure, they will be advised to pursue it through that procedure.

A whistle-blower who presents his/her disclosures in writing will, wherever possible within ten working days, receive:

- an acknowledgement that the concern has been raised;
- an indication of how the school proposes to deal with the matter;
- an estimate of how long it will take to provide a final response;
- an indication of any initial enquiries that have been made; and
- an indication of whether further investigations will take place and, if not, why not.

The whistle-blower will be informed of the outcome of any investigation insofar as this is compatible with any duty of confidentiality on the employer. The extent of the information given to whistleblowers will depend upon a number of factors, e.g. whether the investigation is referred to the police and leads to criminal prosecution. Where an investigation is protracted, it is recommended that the school or relevant line manager keep the whistle-blower updated on the progress of the investigation, as silence may lead them to become suspicious of inaction and make a disclosure externally.

Where a whistle-blower is unwilling to identify him/herself, any person receiving a complaint about malpractice should log the incident and consult the CEO who will seek HR advice to consider whether any investigation should be undertaken.

## **7. Safeguards for whistle-blowers** (see also section 4.3)

### **7.1 Internal procedures**

The decision to report malpractice can be a difficult one for staff, who may possibly fear subsequent victimisation or harassment. No action will be taken against staff who raise a concern in the proper way, and which they reasonably believe to be in the public interest, even if that concern is subsequently discovered to be unfounded after investigation.

However, whistle-blowers who are already the subject of investigation or action under a formal procedure (e.g. discipline, capability or harassment) should not expect the procedure to be discontinued as a result of the disclosure, unless there is good reason for doing so.

### **7.2 Other protections**

To harass, bully, or otherwise subject a person to detriment because they have made a whistleblowing disclosure, or assisted in the investigation of one (for example as a witness), will be considered a disciplinary offence.

Where whistle-blowers do not wish to be identified to others in the course of an investigation that wish will be respected in so far as it is reasonably practicable. However, anonymity cannot be guaranteed. Proper investigation may be more difficult or impossible if the school / Trust is unable to obtain further

information. It is also more difficult to establish whether any allegations are credible and have been made in the public interest. The process of investigation may reveal the identity of whistle-blowers and, especially in serious cases, whistle-blowers may be required to give evidence, either by the school, the Trust, or the police. Any person subject to disciplinary action or prosecution has access to all the evidence.

The school, or the CEO as appropriate, will take all reasonable steps to minimise any difficulties whistle-blowers may experience as a result of raising a concern. Whistle-blowers from Trust schools or shared services team who are required to give evidence in disciplinary or criminal proceedings may seek advice from the CEO on procedural aspects of this obligation. The school / Trust will consider sympathetically requests from whistle-blowers for special leave, counselling or other support.

## **8. Improper disclosures**

No action will be taken against a whistle-blower if a concern is raised in the proper way, which the whistle-blower reasonably believes to be in the public interest. However, if

allegations are not raised in the proper way, and/or the whistle-blower cannot show that they reasonably believe it to be in the public interest, disciplinary sanctions may occur. This is particularly likely if it is believed that the disclosure was also malicious, vexatious, or made for personal gain.

## **9.       Contacts and How the matter can be taken further**

This procedure is intended to provide individuals with an avenue to raise concerns with their school / OMAT. If the whistle-blower is not satisfied, and feels it is right to take the matter further, the following are possible contact points:

<b>CEO</b>	Alastair Heath-Robinson 01473 684922 <a href="mailto:office@omat.org.uk">office@omat.org.uk</a>
<b>Head Teacher</b>	Kasha Blake 01473 251 603 <a href="mailto:schooloffice@handfordhall.omat.org.uk">schooloffice@handfordhall.omat.org.uk</a>
<b>Chair of Local Governing Committee</b>	Colin Kreidewolf 01473 251 603 <a href="mailto:c.kreidewolf@handfordhall.omat.org.uk">c.kreidewolf@handfordhall.omat.org.uk</a>
<b>Chairman of the Finance, Resources &amp; Audit Committee</b>	c/o Mayleen Atima (Chair of Board of Trustees) <a href="mailto:Mayleen.atima@beaumontschool.suffolk.sch.uk">Mayleen.atima@beaumontschool.suffolk.sch.uk</a> 01473 825120
<b>Chair of the Board of Trustees</b>	Mayleen Atima <a href="mailto:Mayleen.atima@beaumontschool.suffolk.sch.uk">Mayleen.atima@beaumontschool.suffolk.sch.uk</a> 01473 825120
<b>OMAT external auditors</b>	Ensors 01473 220022
<b>NSPCC Whistleblowing Advice line</b>	0800 028 0285 <a href="mailto:help@nspcc.org.uk">help@nspcc.org.uk</a>
<b>Confidential counselling hotline</b>	Care First Lifestyle 0808 1682143 <a href="http://www.carefirst-lifestyle.co.uk">www.carefirst-lifestyle.co.uk</a>
<b>Public Concern at Work</b> (Independent whistle-blowing charity for raising concerns about the Chair of the Trust Board)	Helpline: 020 3117 2520 E-mail via online form on website: <a href="https://protect-advice.org.uk/">https://protect-advice.org.uk/</a>
<b>DFE (ESFA) Customer Help Portal</b> (For raising concerns about the Chair of the Trust Board)	Online form can be accessed via: <a href="https://customerhelpportal.education.gov.uk/">https://customerhelpportal.education.gov.uk/</a>
<b>Recognised Trade Union</b>	JCNC
<b>The Health &amp; Safety Executive</b>	01245 706222
<b>Information Commissioner</b>	0303 123 1113
<b>The Pensions Regulator</b>	0845 600 7060
<b>Local Government Ombudsman</b>	0300 061 0614
<b>Ofsted</b>	0300 123 3155
<b>A solicitor</b>	Browne Jacobson 0330 045 2278 <a href="mailto:Charlotte.antoniou@brownejacobson.com">Charlotte.antoniou@brownejacobson.com</a>
<b>Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO)</b>	0300 123 2044 <a href="mailto:LADO@suffolk.gov.uk">LADO@suffolk.gov.uk</a>
<b>The Police</b>	999

If the matter is taken outside OMAT, the whistle-blower must take all reasonable steps to ensure that confidential or privileged information is not disclosed (i.e. confidential information, in whatever format, must not be handed over to a third party).