



Arun Court School: Policy Number 7

Arun Court School - Allegations Against Staff - last updated January 2021

Ratified by main EMAT meeting:

Signature (+ date) Chair of EMAT:Mr Paul Phillips

Signature (+ date) Proprietor:Mrs Beverley-Sarah White

Signature (+ date) Principal of SchoolVicki Williams

Date of next review: January 2022 (Reviewed annually)

Read in conjunction with all 65 main policy documents

Context

These procedures outline the initial response to an allegation of abuse against a teacher or another member of staff. For more detailed guidance, particularly action following the outcome of an initial investigation reference must be made to DfE Guidance.

All schools must have a policy for dealing with allegations against staff. The DfE Guidance on managing such allegations is statutory and must, therefore, be taken into account, as should any local procedures. The DfE guidance covers all staff working with children and young people, either paid or voluntary, permanent staff or temporary.



Introduction

Arun Court School takes its responsibility of care for its students seriously and fully endorses the principles and practice of Every Child Matters. We recognise that any possibility that a member of staff may have hurt a student must be investigated thoroughly, but in a way that does not prejudice either the student or the member of staff. Any investigation of an allegation of abuse against a member of staff must follow the objective, professional standards and routines described here.

Allegations of abuse against staff should not be dealt with under the school's general complaints procedure.

The Surrey Safeguarding Children Partnership [LADO](#) Team is guided by specific legislation and Statutory Guidance, in particular:

The Children Act 1989

The Children Act 1989 places a duty on local authorities to promote and safeguard the welfare of children in need in their area

Education Act 2002

Section 175 of the Education Act 2002 places a duty on:

1. Local Authorities in relation to their education functions; and
2. The governing bodies of maintained schools and the governing bodies of further education institutions (which include sixth-form colleges) in relation to their functions relating to the conduct of the school or the institution

To make arrangements for ensuring that such functions are exercised with a view to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children (in the case of the school or institution, being those children who are either pupils at the school or who are students under 18 years of age attending the further education institution).

The Children Act 2004

Section 11 places duties on a range of organisations and individuals to make arrangements for ensuring that their functions, and any services that they contract out to others, are discharged with regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

Section 11 places a duty on:

- Local authorities and district councils that provide children's and other types of services, including children's and adult social services, public health, housing, sport, culture and leisure services, licensing authorities and youth services
- NHS organisations and agencies and the independent sector, including NHS England and clinical commissioning groups, NHS Trusts, NHS Foundation Trusts and General Practitioners
- The Police, including police and crime commissioners and the chief officer of each police force in England and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime in London
- The British Transport Police
- The National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Companies (35)
- Governors/Directors of Prisons and Young Offender Institutions (YOIs)
- Directors of Secure Training Centres (STCs)
- Principals of Secure Colleges
- Youth Offending Teams/Services (YOTs)

These organisations and agencies should have in place arrangements that reflect the importance of safeguarding and promote the welfare of children (Working together to safeguard children 2018 pg. 56)

Working Together 2020

This Statutory Guidance requires that “. . . Local authorities should . . . have designated a particular officer, or team of officers (either as part of local multi-agency arrangements or otherwise), to be involved in the management and oversight of allegations against people who work with children. Any such officer, or team of officers, should be sufficiently qualified and experienced to be able to fulfil this role effectively, for example, qualified social workers. . . . Arrangements should be put in place to ensure that any allegations about those who work with children are passed to the designated officer, or team of officers, without delay.

Local authorities should put in place arrangements to provide advice and guidance to employers and voluntary organisations and agencies on how to deal with allegations against people who work with children. Local authorities should also ensure that there are appropriate arrangements in place to liaise effectively with the police and other organisations and agencies to monitor the progress of cases and ensure that they are dealt with as quickly as possible, consistent with a thorough and fair process.” (Working Together p.58 and see para 1.4.7. ff below).

Employers, school governors, trustees and voluntary organisations should ensure that they have clear policies in place setting out the process, including timescales for investigation and what support and advice will be available to individuals against whom allegations have been made. Any allegation against people who work with children should be reported immediately to a senior manager within the organisation or agency. The designated officer, or team of officers, should also be informed within one working day of all allegations that come to an employer’s attention or that are made directly to the police.

The Senior Manager may choose to appoint a leadership colleague with appropriate safeguarding experience such as a designated safeguarding lead to manage the liaison with the LADO and or the Police and this person will be known as the Case Manager, throughout this report.

Despite all efforts to recruit safely there will be occasions when allegations are made of abuse by staff or volunteers against children. Each organisation which has employees or volunteers working with children should therefore have clear and accessible policies and procedures, consistent with these Surrey Child Protection Procedures, which explain what should happen when allegations about the behaviour of a member of staff or volunteer are raised. It is the responsibility of Head teacher / Manager to report allegations to, and otherwise liaise with, the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) who has the responsibility to manage and have oversight of allegations against people who work with children.

Surrey Safeguarding Children Partnership (SSCP) should have arrangements in place for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the arrangements to manage allegations.

All references in this document to 'members of staff' and 'employment' should be interpreted as meaning ALL paid or unpaid staff and volunteers, including foster carers and prospective adopters. All references to 'employers' should be taken to include any agency or organisation with responsibility for paid or unpaid staff and volunteers, including foster carers and prospective adopters (note that allegations about adoptive parents should be addressed within the SSCP Child Protection Procedures and Section 47, Children Act 1989). This chapter also applies to any person, who manages or facilitates access to an establishment where children are present.

Allegations dealt with by these procedures

These procedures should be applied when there is an allegation that any person who works with children, in connection with their employment or voluntary activity, with the children's workforce. These procedures also apply to independent contractors such those who may be a partner to a GP service, dental service or provide sports/ fitness coaching service to a school or any other setting where she are the direct service users.

- Behaved in a way that has harmed a child, or may have harmed a child;
- Possibly committed a criminal offence against or related to a child;
- Behaved towards a child or children in a way that indicates they may pose a risk of harm to children.

Allegations can be made in relation to restrictive physical interventions and restraint but can also relate to inappropriate relationships between members of staff and children or young people, for example:

- Having a sexual relationship with a child under 18 if in a position of trust in respect of that child, even if consensual (see ss16-19 Sexual Offences Act 2003);
- 'Grooming', i.e. meeting a child under 16 with intent to commit a relevant offence (see s15 Sexual Offences Act 2003);
- Other 'grooming' behaviour giving rise to concerns of a broader child protection nature e.g. inappropriate text/ e-mail messages or images, gifts, socialising etc.;
- Possession of indecent images / pseudo-photographs of children.

In addition, these procedures should be applied when there is an allegation that any person who works with children:

- Has behaved in a way in their personal life that raises safeguarding concerns. These concerns do not have to directly relate to a child but could, for example, include arrest for possession of a weapon or indecent images of children;
- As a parent or carer, has become subject to child protection procedures;
- Is closely associated with someone in their personal lives (e.g. partner, member of the immediate family or other household member) who may present a risk of harm to child/ren for whom the member of staff is responsible in their employment/volunteering.

Finally, these procedures should be followed where a person's employment is covered by the Childcare Act 2006 (See definition in the statutory guidance) and:

Is living in the same household where another person who is disqualified lives or is employed - a person is disqualified if they are 'found to have committed' an offence which is included in the 2009 Regulations updated July 2018 (a 'relevant offence'). See Working Together to Safeguard Children 2108 and statutory guidance '[Disqualification under the Childcare Act 2006](#)'. This guidance was updated in 2018 (as listed but not detailed at para 1.3 below):

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/disqualification-under-the-childcare-act-2006?utm_source=92a6ba9a-8a48-4071-9f68-4b901c40d2f9&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=govuk-notifications&utm_content=immediate

It is also important to note that, whilst not specifically covered by statutory guidance, the risks associated with the wider family and close associates of the member of staff may also need to be considered even if their work with children does not fall within the remit of the statutory guidance in section 1.2.4.

These procedures should be followed where allegations are made against a 16 and 17 year old who has been put in a position of trust by an organisation in relation to anyone under the age of 18. For example, where they might be involved in coaching a sport or in other school or out of school activities.

The procedures for dealing with allegations need to be applied with common sense and judgement. Many cases may well either not meet the criteria set out above, or may do so without warranting consideration of either a police investigation or Section 47 child protection enquiries by local authority children's social care services. In these cases, employers should follow their safeguarding and other relevant procedures to resolve cases without delay.

The difference between an allegation and a concern

It might not be clear whether an incident constitutes an 'allegation'. It is important to remember that in order to be an allegation the alleged incident has to be sufficiently serious as to suggest that harm has or may have been caused to a child/ren or that the alleged behaviour indicates the individual may pose a risk of harm to children (or otherwise meet the criteria at para 1.2.1. and 1.2.2. above).

Issues that do not meet this threshold may constitute conduct, performance or disciplinary issues and should be addressed by employers using the appropriate organisational procedures.

If it doubt, please consult with the Duty LADO (Telephone number: 0300 123 1650 option 3).

If it is difficult to determine the level of risk associated with an incident the following should be considered:

- Was the incident a disproportionate or inappropriate response in the context of a challenging situation?
- Where the incident involved an inappropriate response to challenging behaviour, had the member of staff had training in managing this?
- Does the member of staff understand that their behaviour was inappropriate and express a wish to behave differently in the future? For example, are they willing to undergo training?
- Does the child or family want to report the incident to the police or would they prefer the matter to be dealt with by the employer?
- Have similar allegations previously been made against the employee – is there a pattern developing?

Incidents which fall short of the threshold could include an accusation that is made second or third hand (by someone who did not witness the alleged incident) and the facts are not clear, or the member of staff alleged to have done this was not there at the time; or there is confusion about the account.

Whether an incident constitutes an allegation and hence needs to be dealt with through these procedures, may need to be discussed between the LADO and the employer's safeguarding lead. If it falls short of this threshold there may still be a role for the LADO to provide advice and support to the employer. Where the matter constitutes a conduct or performance issue, the employer should follow the appropriate disciplinary procedures and let the LADO know of the outcome.

Relevant statutory guidance

- **Working Together to Safeguard Children: Statutory guidance on inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. Available at: [GOV.UK - Working together to safeguard children 2020 and Transition Guidance](#)**
- Detailed guidance can be found for schools and all educational establishments in **Keeping Children Safe in Education: Statutory Guidance for Schools and Colleges (September 2018)**.
- Guidance about the use of physical restraint in schools for governing bodies, head teachers and school staff. Available at: **[GOV.UK - Use of reasonable force in schools](#)**
- Additionally new statutory guidance has been issued '**Disqualification under the Childcare Act 2006**' (September 2018): **[GOV.UK - Disqualification under the Childcare Act 2006](#)**
- Guidance regarding making a referral to the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) website is available at: **[GOV.UK - Making barring referrals to the DBS](#)**
- **Guidance regarding the legal duty to refer and power to refer to the DBS is available at: [GOV.UK - DBS barring referral guidance](#)**
- **Also see [GOV.UK –Information sharing](#)**



Whistle-blowing

All staff should be made aware of the organisation's whistle-blowing policy and feel confident to voice concerns about the attitude or actions of colleagues

If a member of staff believes that a reported allegation or concern is not being dealt with appropriately by their organisation, they should report the matter to their LADO. See also Local Safeguarding Children Partnership Procedure.

should be shared with the [LADO](#) for ongoing risk management and the [LADO\(s\)](#).

The case manager/employer should also consider whether the result that would be achieved by immediate suspension could be obtained by agreeing alternative working arrangements (see below). In many cases an investigation can be resolved quickly and without the need for suspension. The decision around suspension would be the responsibility of the case manager/employer and should be directly informed by the severity, complexity of the allegation and any ongoing Police investigation.

The [LADO](#) service will provide professional advice based upon the facts presented at the time to support the case manager/employer in their decision making, and on rare occasions this may result in challenge to the case manager/employer decision where the [LADO](#) disagrees with the assessment of risk.

Based on assessment of risk, the following alternatives should be considered by the case manager **before** suspending a member of staff:

- Redeployment so that the individual does not have direct contact with the child or children concerned;
- Providing an assistant to be present when the individual has contact with children;
- Redeploying to alternative work so the individual does not have unsupervised access to children;
- Temporarily redeploying the member of staff to another role in a different location.

These alternatives allow time for an informed decision regarding the suspension. This will, however, depend upon the nature of the allegation. The case manager should consider the potential permanent professional reputational damage to employee that can result from suspension where an allegation is later found to be unsubstantiated or maliciously intended.

If immediate suspension is considered necessary, the rationale and justification for such a course of action should be agreed and recorded by both the case manager and the [LADO\(s\)](#).

Where it has been deemed appropriate to suspend the person, written confirmation should be dispatched within one working day, giving as much detail as appropriate for the reasons for the suspension (without revealing details of the allegation). It is not acceptable for an employer to leave a person who has been suspended without any support. The person should be informed at the point of their suspension who their named contact is within the organisation and provided with their contact details.

Where the alleged person is contracted or works independently such as a G.P, childminder or home tutor then a discussion must be held with the senior manager in the setting, or the regulatory body if there is one and the [LADO](#) and a decision made as to who will communicate with the alleged person and how support will be given to the alleged person. It is important to consider the circumstances in each case and for professionals to come together at a MASM meeting to decide how to progress with a view to working together and being flexible in finding ways of managing the concerns.

Children's social care services or the police cannot require the case manager to suspend a member of staff or a volunteer, although they should give appropriate weight to their advice. The power to suspend is vested in the employer. However, where a discussion concludes that there should be enquiries by the children's social care services and/or an investigation by the police, the [LADO\(s\)](#) should canvass police and children's social care services for views about whether the accused member of staff needs to be suspended from contact with children in order to inform consideration of suspension. Police involvement does not make it mandatory to suspend a member of staff; this decision should be taken on a case-by-case basis having undertaken a risk assessment.

If a suspended person is to return to work, the employer should consider what help and support might be appropriate (e.g. a phased return to work and/or provision of a mentor), and also how best to manage the member of staff's contact with the child concerned, if still in the workplace.



Timescales for completing investigations of allegations

It is in everyone's interest to resolve cases as quickly as possible consistent with a fair and thorough investigation. All allegations should be investigated as a priority to avoid any delay. The time taken to investigate and resolve individual cases depends on a variety of factors including the nature, seriousness and complexity of the allegation, but these targets should be achieved in all but truly exceptional cases. Target timescales are shown below:

- For those cases where it is clear immediately that the allegation is unsubstantiated or malicious, they should be resolved within one week;
- Where the initial consideration decides that the allegation does not involve a possible criminal offence it will be for the employer to deal with it, although if there are concerns about child protection, the employer should discuss them with the [LADO](#);
- In such cases, if the nature of the allegation does not require formal disciplinary action, the employer should institute appropriate action within three working days;
- If a disciplinary hearing is required and can be held without further investigation, the hearing should be held within 15 working days

It is expected that:

- 80 per cent of cases should be resolved within one month;
- 90 per cent should be resolved within three months;
- All but the most exceptional cases should be completed within 12 months.

Managing allegations flow chart

<https://www.surreyscb.org.uk/resources/managing-allegations-flow-chart/>

Initial allegation made to the school



Any allegation of abuse of a student by a teacher must be reported to the DSL's Vicky and Hannah. Should the initial allegation first be made to any other member of staff then that member of staff must either request the person raising the allegation to report it to the DSL or if that is not possible to pass details of the allegation to the DSL immediately. **Should the allegation be made against the DSL or Proprietor then this should be brought to the attention of the Chair of EMAT (Governors) immediately.**

Should the allegation meet any of the following criteria then the DSL should report the allegation to the local authority designated officer **the same day that the allegation is received** that a teacher or member of staff or volunteer at the school has:

- **behaved in a way that has harmed a child, or may have harmed a child or;**
- **possibly committed a criminal offence against or related to a child or;**
- **behaved towards a child or children in a way that indicates s/he would pose a risk of harm if they work regularly or closely with children.**

The DSL should not investigate the allegation at this stage. The discussion with the LADO needs to happen first. If the allegation is not patently false and there is cause to suspect that a child is suffering or is likely to suffer significant harm, the local authority designated officer will immediately refer to children's social care and ask for a strategy discussion in accordance with Working Together to Safeguard Children to be convened straight away. In those circumstances the strategy discussion should include the local authority designated officer and the Child Protection Officer. If there is not cause to suspect that "significant harm" is an issue, but a criminal offence might have been committed, the local authority designated officer should immediately inform the police and convene a similar discussion to decide whether a police investigation is needed. That discussion will also involve the school and any other agencies involved with the child.

Action following initial consideration

Where the initial consideration decides that the allegation does not involve a possible criminal offence it will be for the DSL to deal with it in consultation with School Proprietor. In such cases, if the nature of the allegation does not require formal disciplinary action appropriate action should be instituted within three working days. If a disciplinary hearing is required and can be held without further investigation, the hearing should be held within 15 working days.

Where further investigation is required to inform consideration of disciplinary action the DSL and the proprietor should discuss who will undertake that with the local authority designated officer.

The investigating officer should aim to provide a report to the employer within 10 working days.



Suspension – when it should be considered

Suspension should be considered only in cases where there is cause to suspect a child or other children at the place of employment is/are at risk of harm/further harm or the case is so serious that it might be grounds for dismissal. The case manager must consider carefully whether the circumstances warrant suspension from contact with children until the allegation is resolved, and may wish to seek advice from their HR adviser.



Investigation outcomes

The following definitions should be used when determining the outcome of allegation investigations:

- a. **Substantiated:** there is sufficient identifiable evidence to prove the allegation;
- b. **False:** there is sufficient evidence to disprove the allegation;
- c. **Malicious:** there is clear evidence to prove there has been a deliberate act to deceive and the allegation is entirely false;
- d. **Unfounded:** there is no evidence or proper basis which supports the allegation being made. It might also indicate that the person making the allegation misinterpreted the incident or was mistaken about what they saw. Alternatively they may not have been aware of all the circumstances;
- e. **Unsubstantiated:** this is not the same as a false allegation. It means that there is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation. The term, therefore, does not imply guilt or innocence.

On receipt of the report of the disciplinary investigation, the DSL and the proprietor should consult the local authority designated officer, and decide whether a disciplinary hearing is needed within two working days. If a hearing is needed it should be held within 15 working days.

In any case in which children's social care has undertaken enquiries to determine whether the child or children are in need of protection, the proprietor and Chair of EMAT should take account of any relevant information obtained in the course of those enquiries when considering disciplinary action.

The local authority designated officer should continue to liaise with the school to monitor progress of the case and provide advice or support when required or requested.



Case subject to police investigation

If the police and/or Crown Prosecution Service decide not to charge the individual with an offence, or decide to administer a caution, or the person is acquitted by a Court, the police should wherever possible aim to pass all information they have which may be relevant to a disciplinary case to the Principal within three working days of the decision. In those circumstances the Principal and the local authority designated officer should proceed as described above.

In any case in which children's social care has undertaken enquiries to determine whether the child or children are in need of protection, any information obtained in the course of those enquiries which is relevant to a disciplinary case should also be passed to the school and the Principal should request this information.



Substantiated outcomes

Referral to the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)

The DBS was established under the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 and merges the functions previously carried out by the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA). The relevant legislation is set out in the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012.

There is a legal requirement for employers to make a referral to the DBS where they think that an individual has engaged in conduct that harmed (or is likely to harm) a child; or if a person otherwise poses a risk of harm to a child; or if there is an investigation and the outcome is substantiated either by criminal investigation or by the balance of probabilities.

If an allegation is substantiated and the person is dismissed or the employer ceases to use the person's service or the person resigns or otherwise ceases to provide his/her services, the guidance regarding making a referral - available on the [Disclosure and Barring Service website](#).

The DBS will refer cases involving teachers to the Teaching Regulation Agency (TRA) to consider prohibiting the individual from teaching.

Legal duty to refer and power to refer

The following groups have legal duty to refer information to the DBS:

- Regulated activity suppliers (employers and volunteer managers);
- Personnel suppliers that may be an employment agency, employment business or an educational institution

The power to refer may be used when a local authority or regulatory body is acting in a role other than as a regulated activity provider, for example, when undertaking a safeguarding role.

- Local authorities;
- A Health and Social care (HSC) trust;
- Keepers of registers e.g. [General Medical Council](#), [Nursing and Midwifery Council](#), HCPC in England, Wales and Northern Ireland;
- Supervisory authorities e.g. [Care Quality Commission](#), [Ofsted](#), in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

The DBS will refer cases involving teachers to the Teaching Regulation Agency (TRA) to consider prohibiting the individual from teaching. The TRA is part of the Department for Education and is responsible for the regulation of teachers in respect of serious misconduct. Whenever a local authority refers a person to the DBS, they must consider whether they are doing so under the duty to refer or their power to refer.



Supporting those involved

Employers have a duty of care to their employees. They should act to manage and minimise the stress inherent in the allegations process. Support for the individual is key to fulfilling this duty. Individuals should be informed of concerns or allegations as soon as possible and given an explanation of the likely course of action, unless there is an objection by the children's social care services or the police.

The person who is the subject of the allegation should be kept informed of the progress of the case and consideration should be given to what other support is appropriate for the individual. Particular care needs to be taken when employees are suspended to ensure that they are kept informed of both the progress of their case and current work-related issues. Social contact with colleagues and friends should not be prevented unless there is evidence to suggest that such contact is likely to be prejudicial to the gathering and presentation of evidence.

Parents or carers of a child or children involved should be told about the allegation as soon as possible if they do not already know of it. However, where a strategy discussion is required, or police or children's social care services need to be involved, the case manager should not do so until those agencies have been consulted and have agreed what information can be disclosed to the parents or carers. Parent or carers should also be kept informed about the progress of the case, and told the outcome where there is not a criminal prosecution, including the outcome of any disciplinary process. The deliberations of a disciplinary hearing, and the information taken into account in reaching a decision, cannot normally be disclosed, but the parents or carers of the child should be told the outcome in confidence. Parents and carers should also be made aware of the prohibition on reporting or publishing allegations about teachers in section 141F of the Education Act 2002. If parents or carers wish to apply to the court to have reporting restrictions removed, they should be told to seek legal advice. In cases where a child may have suffered significant harm, or there may be a criminal prosecution, children's social care services, or the police as appropriate, should consider what support the child or children involved may need.



Resignations and 'compromise agreements'

If the accused person resigns, or ceases to provide their services, this should not prevent an allegation being followed up in accordance with this guidance. It is important that every effort is made to reach a conclusion in all cases of allegations bearing on the safety or welfare of children, including any in which the person concerned refuses to cooperate with the process. Wherever possible the accused should be given a full opportunity to answer the allegation and make representations about it. But the process of recording the allegation and any supporting evidence, and reaching a judgement about whether it can be substantiated on the basis of all the information available, should continue even if that cannot be done or the accused does not cooperate. It may be difficult to reach a conclusion in those circumstances, and it may not be possible to apply any disciplinary sanctions if a person's period of notice expires before the process is complete, but it is important to reach and record a conclusion wherever possible.

So-called 'compromise agreements', by which a person agrees to resign if the employer agrees not to pursue disciplinary action, and both parties agree a form of words to be used in any future reference, should not be used in these cases. Such an agreement will not prevent a thorough police investigation where that is appropriate. Nor can it override the statutory duty to make a referral to the Disclosure and Barring Service where circumstances require that.



Record keeping

Details of allegations that are found to have been malicious should be removed from personnel records. However, for all other allegations, it is important that a clear and comprehensive summary of the allegation, details of how the allegation was followed up and resolved, and a note of any action taken and decisions reached, is kept on the confidential personnel file of the accused, and a copy provided to the person concerned.

The purpose of the record is to enable accurate information to be given in response to any future request for a reference, where appropriate. It will provide clarification in cases where future DBS Disclosures reveal information from the police about an allegation that did not result in a criminal conviction and it will help to prevent unnecessary re-investigation if, as sometimes happens, an allegation re-surfaces after a period of time. The record should be retained at least until the accused has reached normal retirement age or for a period of 10 years from the date of the allegation if that is longer.

The Information Commissioner has published guidance on employment records in its Employment Practices Code and supplementary guidance, which provides some practical advice on employment retention.

References

Cases in which an allegation was proven to be false, unsubstantiated, unfounded or malicious should not be included in employer references. A history of repeated concerns or allegations which have all been found to be unsubstantiated, malicious etc. should also not be included in any reference.

MONITORING OF THIS POLICY - KNOWLEDGE OF ALL POLICIES

This policy is ratified by full EMAT meeting and is reviewed Annually. This policy is constantly monitored on the ground by the senior Team. The Proprietor / Executive Head also monitors the use of this policy. The Chair of EMAT monitors this policy.

All staff have a responsibility to monitor their own practice and ensure they are following policies. They risk disciplinary action if policy is not followed. They risk criminal prosecution if their actions, as a result of not following policy, endanger the welfare of a child.

It is important that staff read and understand this policy, but also read and understand all 65 policies in this folder. If they are unsure at any stage they should always refer back to the folder, the comprehensive safeguarding support folders or ask a senior member of staff. They should ensure that the standards document for their job role and the school code of conduct are available and known to them at all times.