

The Alan Turing Institute

WHISTLEBLOWING POLICY

Owner	Chief Operating Officer
Date	November 2017
Version	V1.1

Table of Contents

1. Purpose.....	3
2. Scope.....	3
3. Policy	3
- Before taking action	4
4. Matters of concern	5
5. Informal procedure	5
6. Formal procedure.....	6
7. Appeals procedure	6
8. Wrong-doing discovered while working for an outside organisation.....	7
9. Policy review	7
10. Document control	7

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The Alan Turing Institute's whistleblowing policy encourages and enables employees and researchers to speak out when they encounter or suspect malpractice.
- 1.2 The Alan Turing Institute (including its trading subsidiary and hereafter referred to as the Institute) will not condone any form of malpractice in the workplace and is committed to creating a safe, fair and honest working environment.
- 1.3 No one who raises a genuine concern about malpractice will be at risk of losing their job or suffering any form of retribution or detriment as a result of doing so including harassment or victimisation from another employee.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all employees of the Institute (which includes, but is not limited to, permanent staff, temporary staff, secondees, agency workers and contractors, herein referred to as 'employees'), and those who undertake research at the Institute (which includes, but is not limited to, Turing Fellows, Turing Research Fellows, doctoral students, visiting researchers, herein referred to as 'researchers').
- 2.2 People in management positions throughout the Institute are expected to recognise their responsibilities and to adopt and implement the policy and adhere to the corresponding procedures.

3. Policy

- 3.1 If an employee or researcher has any concerns regarding the behaviour of others (including illegal, improper or unethical acts), they can take confidential action to raise their concerns.
- 3.2 The employee or researcher will be protected from any detriment if:
 - 3.2.1 they raise a genuine concern in accordance with the procedures set out below; and
 - 3.2.2 their concern is covered by one of the categories set out in the Public Interest Disclosure Act (PIDA); and
 - 3.2.3 it is made in the public interest and they have a reasonable belief that the behaviour in question is occurring, has occurred, or is likely to occur.
- 3.3 If the employee or researcher feels unable to raise their concerns with a member of staff internally, they may also raise them with a Trustee of the Institute.
- 3.4 Further information on the PIDA and guidance on whistleblowing can be found at www.gov.uk/whistleblowing
- 3.5 If an employee or researcher is found to have raised a concern maliciously or vexatiously, they will lose the protection of the Whistleblowing Policy and may be subject to disciplinary action under the Institute's or employing organisation's Disciplinary Policy.
- 3.6 All concerns will be treated in confidence and every effort will be made not to reveal anyone's identity in so far as this is consistent with the proper examination and investigation of the matter. If it is necessary to reveal the employee's or researcher's identity, this will be discussed with them at the earliest possible stage of the procedure.

Before taking action

- 3.7 Employees and researchers should not normally disclose confidential information or concerns relating to the Institute or the establishment's business or other employees or researchers without first raising them in accordance with the procedures set out in this policy. If an employee or researcher feels uncomfortable using the internal procedure, there are external contacts to whom they can make a disclosure (see paragraph 3.3).
- 3.8 A procedure already exists for employees and researchers to raise personal employment-related grievances. In addition, the Code of Conduct policy sets out the standards of personal behaviour to which employees and researchers must conform.
- 3.9 A protected disclosure is different to a grievance in that it will concern the conduct of another person in the workplace (whether or not that conduct affects the complainant personally) in circumstances where the complainant genuinely believes that the conduct in question amounts to a criminal offence, a breach of a legal obligation, or something likely to endanger health or safety or damage the environment.
- 3.10 A grievance will concern an employee or researcher personally, e.g. the individual may have a complaint about:
- 3.10.1 their pay or working hours;
 - 3.10.2 the amount of work that they are expected to do;
 - 3.10.3 working conditions; or
 - 3.10.4 being bullied by fellow workers.

Examples of the difference between a grievance and a protected disclosure	
Grievance	Protected Disclosure
An employee's or researcher's complaint about the type of work that they are being asked to do, for example if it is not covered by their contract or grant	A disclosure that an individual has been instructed to carry out actions that they genuinely believe to be illegal, e.g. to falsify tax returns
An employee's or researcher's complaint that they have received insufficient safety training	A disclosure that safety rules within the workplace are routinely being flouted, thus endangering safety
An employee's or researcher's complaint about the hours that they are expected to work	A disclosure that the requirements imposed by the company on a group of staff represent a breach of the working time legislation

- 3.11 Allegations of misconduct in research should be raised in accordance with the Institute's policy on that matter.
- 3.12 If an employee or researcher is in any doubt about the way in which they should raise their concern on a matter of public interest, they should contact HR, a senior manager or their Institute contact.
- 3.13 The employee or researcher may be accompanied by a representative of HR or work colleague at any stage of the informal or formal procedure.

4. Matters of concern

- 4.1 To be protected the employee or researcher needs to make a 'qualifying disclosure' about alleged or actual malpractice. This could be:
 - 4.1.1 That a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed;
 - 4.1.2 That a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which they are subject or has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to uphold professional standards or practice and/or behaviour;
 - 4.1.3 That the health and safety of an individual is being or is likely to be endangered;
 - 4.1.4 That the environment has been, is being or is likely to be damaged;
 - 4.1.5 That a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur;
 - 4.1.6 That a person is receiving or has received unlawful bribes, financial incentives or inducements for personal gain or that a person is involved (or generally suspected of being involved) in fraud;
 - 4.1.7 That information on any of the above has been, is being or is likely to be concealed.
- 4.2 For the employee's or researcher's disclosure to be protected by the law it should be made to the right person and in the right way. The employee or researcher must reasonably believe that the information is substantially true.
- 4.3 If the employee or researcher feels unable to raise their concerns internally they must also reasonably believe that they are making the disclosure to the right 'prescribed person'.
- 4.4 Anyone wishing to raise a concern is encouraged to put their name to their allegation. Anonymous disclosures are less powerful and more difficult to investigate, but will be considered by the Institute in the context of the following:
 - 4.4.1 The seriousness of the disclosure
 - 4.4.2 The credibility of the concern
 - 4.4.3 Fairness to the individual who may be the subject of the concern raised
 - 4.4.4 Whether there is a likelihood that the allegation can be confirmed using reliable sources

5. Informal procedure

- 5.1 If the employee or researcher has a concern about wrong doing under any of the categories listed in section 4, they can initially seek to resolve the matter informally and in confidence. The employee or researcher can request an interview with their line manager or supervisor or Institute contact (should this be inappropriate because this person is implicated in the matter, they can ask for an interview with a more senior manager and or researcher) or with the Head of HR.
- 5.2 The employee or researcher should set out their concerns and the reasons why they are a matter of public interest. The manager or supervisor or Institute contact will promptly consider whether there is substance in the employee's or researcher's concerns and if so how they can be resolved, where necessary seeking advice from HR. There will be no record made of informal concerns or any reference to them on official files etc., including any action taken to address them.

6. Formal procedure

- 6.1 If the employee or researcher believes that the matter of concern is of a more serious nature, and/or that it cannot be or has not been resolved satisfactorily through the informal procedure, they can raise it formally (verbally or in writing) and in confidence with their line manager, their supervisor or their Institute contact. If the employee's or researcher's concerns involve, or may involve, an individual employee or researcher it will be dealt with by a senior manager or Institute contact.
- 6.2 The employee's or researcher's line manager or the senior manager will meet with the employee or researcher as soon as possible to ascertain the details of their concern. The employee or researcher may be accompanied by a work colleague at the meeting. The employee or researcher will be asked if they want to disclose their identity. If the employee or researcher does not wish to make a written statement, the manager will write a brief summary of the meeting. The employee or researcher will be given an opportunity to comment on the note, which should be agreed by both parties.
- 6.3 It may be necessary for the manager or Institute contact to carry out an investigation and make an objective assessment of the concern. If the investigation reveals circumstances in which disciplinary action against individuals would be appropriate, the manager (in consultation with the Head of HR) will take the necessary procedural steps. This may involve the HR departments of host universities for researchers not employed by the Institute.
- 6.4 In some cases, the manager or Institute contact may refer the matter to a more senior manager because the resolution of the concern does not rest within their authority.
- 6.5 The employee or researcher will be advised of progress and of the outcome of their complaint. Although it may not always be possible to provide the employee or researcher with a full account, as much information as possible will be provided about the actions taken to deal with the employee's or researcher's cause for concern.
- 6.6 In some circumstances, it may be appropriate to refer the employee's or researcher's concerns to the Institute Director. This individual will take whatever steps are necessary to consider the case in the spirit of this policy and resolve the problem. These steps will normally involve a formal investigation of the facts and include interviewing the employee or researcher and any other individuals involved in the case.
- 6.7 It may not be possible to protect an employee's or researcher's anonymity if they discuss the case with others outside the investigation.

7. Appeals procedure

- 7.1 All employees and researchers have the right to appeal against the outcome of the original investigation.
- 7.2 Details of the person to whom the appeal should be sent will be included in the decision letter.
- 7.3 The appeal should indicate the full grounds upon which it is made and must be sent in writing within seven working days of receipt of the decision letter.
- 7.4 An employee or researcher can submit new evidence or information that they consider relevant to the appeal, raise procedural issues, or comment on those

matters they believe have received insufficient consideration. The employee or researcher should enclose copies of any new documentation to support their case.

- 7.5 The purpose of the appeal is to review the outcome of the original investigation and basis upon which the original decision was made.
- 7.6 The appeal will be heard by a person who has had no previous involvement in the case. In exceptional cases the appeal may be heard by someone outside of the Institute. The person hearing the appeal will be accompanied by the Head of HR.

8. Wrong-doing discovered while working for an outside organisation

- 8.1 If an employee or researcher suspects wrongdoing while working for or based at an outside organisation, they should use the internal procedures of that organisation, contacting the organisation’s HR team if necessary. The employee or researcher may also contact the Institute HR team for advice.

9. Policy review

- 9.1 This policy will be regularly reviewed to incorporate any legislation changes.

10. Document control

- 1.1 Version control

Version control					
Version (Issue No.)	Date of Issue	Review Date	Author	Approved	Owner
V1.0	August 2016	August 2017	N. Thorpe		Chief Operating Officer
V1.1	November 2017		J. Atkins		Chief Operating Officer

- 1.2 Related documents

Related documents	
Document Title	Doc. Ref. No.
Disciplinary Policy	HRPOL010
Harassment and Bullying Policy	HRPOL008
Grievance Policy	HRPOL001
Bribery and Corruption	TBA