Park is an EMAS certified company and its Environmental Management System is certified to ISO 14001. 100% of the inks used are vegetable oil based, 95% of press chemicals are recycled for further use and on average 99% of any waste associated with this production will be recycled. The papers are a combination of 100% and 50% recycled fibre. The pulp for each is bleached using an Elemental Chlorine Free (ECF) process. All papers are FSC® certified.
RESPONSIBLE BEHAVIOUR

“Speaking up for what’s right”

LEADERS GUIDE
2014

OVERVIEW

BAE Systems is committed to being a recognised leader in business conduct. Our ethics programme has been successfully integrated into our strategy and governance, and forms a fundamental part of our decision-making, underpinned by our values of Trusted, Innovative and Bold.

We are operating in a challenging business environment and it’s essential we remain vigilant to the issues which could compromise our business. The Code of Conduct and related training programmes provide support in understanding the standards of business conduct that everyone is expected to follow, giving practical guidance to help deal with ethical issues and information on where to seek guidance and help. Regular and engaging training like this is a vital part of being a responsible business and ensuring everyone understands their responsibility in maintaining our high standards of business conduct.

The scenarios that form this training are based on actual cases that have taken place within BAE Systems. Some situations may seem straightforward while others are more ambiguous, in the same way we face different challenges in everyday life. Identifying the ethical issues involved and asking ourselves how we would go about resolving them allows us to explore strategies for acting on our values successfully.

Thank you for your continued help and support

Ian King
Chief Executive
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INTRODUCTION

Welcome to “Responsible Behaviour – Speaking up for what’s right”, the 2014 Code of Conduct refresher training, which is required to be taken by all employees.

The training has been designed to continue our understanding, awareness and application of our Code of Conduct and encompasses the feedback that we have received from BAE Systems employees on a continuous basis.

This year we bring our scenarios to life using animation. There are five scenarios and each scenario will be available in two different versions:

- **EMPLOYEE**: one that is more applicable to an audience of employees – where they will consider the dilemmas posed from the perspective of those involved; the responsibilities that apply and what help is available to them

- **SUPERVISOR/PEOPLE MANAGER**: one that is more applicable to an audience of supervisors/people managers – where they will consider the dilemmas posed from a position of management, discussing what they would do in that situation and what responsibilities they have; how a manager should handle things and what resources are available to them

Scenarios are based on real events and so we have been able to give a summary of the outcomes, as they would have happened.

To make this training effective we ask you, as leaders, to take an active role in delivering and facilitating sessions that openly discuss Responsible Behaviour and Speaking up at BAE Systems and your locality, referencing the decision-making model wherever possible.

This will require you to select a minimum of 2 scenarios for each session and ensure that all participants have the opportunity to contribute to the discussion. Each session should take no longer than one hour.

This pack contains all of the material that you will need to prepare for and deliver these sessions

- Leaders Guide
- DVD
- Case Cards (including the decision-making model)

Please remember that the main objective of the session is to promote and generate open and honest discussion – if in doing this employees are able to bring in their own experiences and views to supplement the material then that should be fully encouraged, especially where it creates further debate and understanding.

As always, we would like to thank you for your continued support
GETTING STARTED

Having selected the scenarios that you will use:

1. Welcome the employees and make sure they complete the attendance sheet

2. Introduce the session – play the introductory message/read it from Page 4 of this guide

3. Arrange large groups into smaller groups (of 4 to 6) if needed

4. Go through a selected scenario (using leaders guide)
   a. Run the scenario, using the DVD or the Case Card
   b. Ask the group(s) to discuss the scenario and identify the potential issues as well as what actions characters in the scenario should take – encourage them to share any similar experiences they may have had

5. Ask the group(s) to share their discussion, the issues they identified and their preferred actions to deal with the identified issues
   a. Use the leaders guide for more information on each of the scenarios

6. Close the scenario by reading out “What actually happened?” – This is how BAE Systems would have dealt with the case

7. Repeat items 4 through 6 for additional scenarios

8. Close the session
   a. Remind employees of the importance of speaking up and where they can go
   b. Remind them that the Company will support them in all instances where reports are made honestly and in good faith
   c. That the Company will not tolerate retaliation or retribution against an employee who reports a concern or suspected misconduct

9. Collect completed attendance sheet for upload onto training records
RESPONSIBLE DECISION-MAKING MODEL

Within the scenarios there could be many issues presented, therefore how do we make the “right” decision when faced with issues that could be complicated, ambiguous or difficult? Our ability to answer that question is critical to the success of our Company.

When it comes to doing the right thing, it’s not a question of whether we will ever face a difficult decision; it is a question of when. The decision-making model is there to help you consider all the information when making difficult decisions. The model can be found on the Case Cards.

RESPONSIBLE DECISION-MAKING

Remember that you are responsible for raising concerns while respecting the confidentiality of others.
ATTENDANCE RECORDING AND EVALUATION

This training is mandatory for all employees and it is important to record the attendance of employees at your sessions. It is your responsibility as the session leader to ensure attendance sheets are completed and sent for uploading onto training records in accordance with your local process.

Evaluation is critical in supporting Total Performance and our ability to continually improve. Please encourage all employees to complete an evaluation form.

For information on the attendance process and the evaluation form, refer to the following page on the Corporate Responsibility Intranet site:


Help and Support
- Code of Conduct
- Human Resources
- Leaders, Managers and Supervisors
- Ethics Officers
- Business Conduct Team
- Trade Union Representatives
### SUMMARY OF THE SCENARIOS

Below is a summary on each of the scenarios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Geographic Implications</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor/People Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the Know</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor/People Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It’s just Golf</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor/People Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Network</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor/People Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Surprise Visit</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor/People Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synopsis</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| An employee feels uncomfortable speaking up and raising concerns is impacted by a manager who is not on site and works a different shift                                                                                                                                                                                                  | ● Inclusive Workplace Behaviour  
● Respect of Others                                                                                       |
| A Manager of a geographically diverse project team struggles with communication and demonstrating openness to hearing bad news                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                              |
| An employee sees unusual behaviour from a colleague and considers how to raise his concerns to his Supervisor/People Manager                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | ● Security Breach  
● Use of Company Information technology  
● Insider Threat                                                                                   |
| A Manager hears concerns that an employee has been exhibiting unusual behaviour, but also they are having personal problems                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                              |
| An employee sets up a golfing trip for a visiting customer and feels pressured by his Manager to arrange it no matter what                                                                                                                                                                                                               | ● Gifts and Hospitality  
● Intimidation                                                                                     |
| A Manager who had requested his team to set up a golfing trip for a visiting customer is surprised to hear that adhering to policy has been overlooked                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                              |
| An employee is insecure about raising his concerns over a new employee’s use of social media, due to the new employee’s friendship with their Manager                                                                                                                                                                                                 | ● Social Networking  
● Time Charging  
● Proprietary Information                                                                                                                                  |
| A Manager finds that her new hire’s use of social media is problematic and discusses how best to approach her given their personal relationship                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                              |
| A Supervisor has an issue with an underperforming direct report who is also in a relationship with their Director                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | ● Conflicts of Interest  
● Respect of Others                                                                                                                                       |
| A Supervisor is struggling to deal with an underperforming direct report who is in a relationship with their Director                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                              |
Characters: Eric: Manager; Richard: Direct Report – Team Member; Sarah: Direct Report – Team Member.

EMPLOYEE
Scene 1: Richard and Sarah are colleagues on a shipyard site and are having a conversation about their Manager, who is located on a different international site to them. They are frustrated and feel that Eric doesn’t trust them to make the right decisions and that the distance between them makes it hard for them to feel comfortable speaking up about project issues. They feel that Eric doesn’t respect their working day as he constantly arranges meetings at the end of it. Eric makes constant references to football, which neither of them really understands or are interested in.

Topic: Inclusive Work Behaviour and Respect of Others

Potential Issues:
- Richard and Sarah feel alienated and distant from their Manager
- They do not feel comfortable in speaking up to Eric
- Eric is constantly making football references which irritates the team and detracts from the overall message
- Eric hasn’t really considered the impact his actions may be having on the team, such as the time of day he is arranging meetings

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
- The ease with which different perspectives and negative feelings can creep into the workplace and impact morale
- How employees can feel that they are not in a position to speak up, never mind how much the Manager believes they can and they should
- How making assumptions about the intent of the behaviour of others can lead to misunderstandings and a lack of trust
- Whilst Eric had all the right intent for the success of his team and the project, perceptions in others was quite different

What actually happened?
Another team member did take the opportunity to let Eric know how Richard and Sarah felt.

As a result Eric sought out and was given support through training and coaching on how to better manage his team. At his invitation the team had some good open discussions with him about their feelings and frustrations, and came to an agreement on working patterns and methods of communication they could use other than meetings. Eric promised to try and become less of a football geek, at work anyway!

Policy Reference:
- People Policy
SCENARIO ONE: GEOGRAPHIC IMPLICATIONS

Characters: Eric: Manager; Richard: Direct Report – Team Member; Sarah: Direct Report – Team Member; Mohammad: Direct Report – Team Member.

SUPERVISOR/PEOPLE MANAGER

Scene 2: Eric, the Manager is having a conversation with Mohammad, a team member based at his site. They are discussing the project and how it needs to be completed quickly. Mohammad shares with Eric that both Richard and Sarah, who are his direct reports, based at an international site, are concerned about many things: Football references; late night meetings and a perception that Eric doesn’t respect or trust them.

Topic: Inclusive Work Behaviour and Respect of Others

Potential Issues:
- Eric is clearly focused on meeting the deadline but perhaps at the cost of other objectives
- Eric is constantly making football references that are out of context and not understood by his team
- Arranging meetings after the end of the working day for others is disruptive and demotivating
- The feedback Mohammad provides clearly indicates a need for change in the way Eric is managing and communicating with his team

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
- Eric needs to understand the impact he is having on his team through his actions – including the language he uses and expectations for attending meetings
- The team need to understand from Eric that he really does have their interests as well as those of the project in mind – and that he would want to know of any issues and concerns
- Managing a team remotely is difficult – two-way and open communication are critical for creating a working environment where employees feel they can speak up and will be listened to

What actually happened?
As a result of the feedback he received from Mohammad, Eric sought out support, by way of training and coaching, to help him better manage the team. He also invited the team to share their perspectives and frustrations with him so that he could understand what needed to be changed, in him and their working relationship.

The team agreed on other methods of effective communication without so many meetings and how they could and should raise any concerns they had to him directly. Eric promised to try and become less of a football geek, at work anyway!

Policy Reference:
- People Policy
SCENARIO TWO: IN THE KNOW

Characters: Mark: Direct Report – Team Member; Lucy: Direct Report – Team Member; Chris: New Employee.

EMPLOYEE

Scene 1: At the start of their shift, Mark and Lucy, who used to work on the team, are discussing a new member of their old team – Chris. Mark confides to Lucy that Chris is displaying some unusual behaviour. Chris is working evenings and weekends and accessing information at all kinds of hours. He changes the screen over whatever he is working on when someone approaches. He also has a USB stick on his key fob. Mark is unsure if he should say anything to Chris’s manager as Chris has the technical skills needed for the project and knows that they wouldn’t want to lose him. But there is something not right.


Potential Issues:
- Mark suspects that there could be a serious issue but doesn’t feel comfortable speaking up, for a number of reasons, including the managers possible reaction
- As he isn’t part of that team any more Mark is unsure if he is in a position to say anything to anyone
- Mark and Lucy are almost afraid to report something that may turn out to be nothing, fearing being called tell-tales

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
- Just because Mark is no longer part of that team, does not mean that he should ignore what he sees or suspects
- The potential threat of Chris viewing, downloading and removing sensitive information he has no right to access is a very serious one
- The Company will always support employees who report concerns honestly and in good faith
- Each of us has a responsibility to not let concerns go unresolved and to report them as soon as possible

What actually happened?
Mark did raise his concerns with Simon who sought further help and advice. It turned out that Chris had some issues at home that he was avoiding by being at work for so many hours. His changing of screens when anyone walked nearby was nothing more than him applying what he believed to be due care in ensuring that those who should not see the information he was working on could not. He had only been accessing information he needed to for the project he was working on.

And, after Chris handed over the USB stick it, was proven that it had never been used to download Company material. He kept it with him as it had personal information and photos on but hadn’t realised that he wasn’t allowed to have it in that work area. He gladly agreed not to bring such devices into work again.

Mark was thanked for speaking up, the right thing to have done in the circumstances.

Policy Reference:
- Security Policy
- IT Acceptable Use Policy
SCENARIO TWO: IN THE KNOW

Characters: Simon: Manager; Sanjay: Manager (Simon’s Peer); Mark: Direct Report – Team Member.

SUPERVISOR/PEOPLE MANAGER
Scene 1: Mark has a meeting with Simon his old Manager to speak with him about concerns that he has with Chris, the new team member. He tells Simon that Chris is working evenings and weekends, accessing information at all kinds of hours, as if he is hiding something. He also carries a USB stick on his key fob, which is very unusual as we are not allowed to use them at work. Simon tells Mark to leave it with him and he will deal with it. Simon then calls Sanjay, who knows Chris, to discuss the situation. Both Simon and Sanjay know that Mark can overreact and is this just one of those times! But Sanjay also tells Simon that he thinks that Chris is having problems at home.


Potential Issues:
- Why didn’t Simon know about problems that Chris is having at home? Should Chris have told him?
- Could this be another over reaction from Mark? If so how should it be handled, if at all?
- What are the potential issues and threats from what Mark has told Simon, and who else would need to know?

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
- Whether or not Simon believes the information he has received from Mark he has a responsibility to listen and take appropriate action
- The potential threats associated with sensitive information being accessed, downloaded and taken away from the workplace are serious, and so need to be dealt with urgently
- Sanjay sharing that Chris may be having problems at home could be relevant, but needs to be handled with sensitivity and possible support from others

What actually happened?
After seeking some guidance on applicable policies Simon spoke with Chris directly about the concerns. It turned out that Chris had some issues at home that he was avoiding by being at work for so many hours. Chris agreed to speak to HR to see what support may be available to him through these difficult times. His changing of screens when anyone walked nearby was no more than him applying what he believed to be due care in ensuring that those who should not see the information he was working on could not. He had only been accessing information he needed to for the project he was working on.

When asked about the USB stick Chris handed it over to Simon who had it checked by IT Security. Chris carried it with him everywhere as it had personal information and photos saved onto it. It had never been connected to his laptop or the IT system at work. Having not previously been aware of the policy he agreed to not bring it into work again.

Simon went back to Mark and thanked him for raising his concerns and told him that those concerns had been looked into and appropriate actions taken.

Policy Reference:
- Security Policy
- IT Acceptable Use Policy
SCENARIO THREE: IT’S JUST GOLF

Characters: Steve: Direct Report – Team Member; Jack: Direct Report – Team Member; Seeta: Direct Report – Team Member.

EMPLOYEE

Scene 1: Steve is talking with Jack about helping him arrange a golfing trip for the DriveDeep customer as Paul their manager said it would be a good idea. Jack agrees to help out, as his brother-in-law is a member of the new private club. Later in the day, Jack is talking with Seeta about helping Steve arrange the golfing trip. Seeta is surprised as he thought that approval would be needed and that the DriveDeep team is affiliated with their country’s government. Steve is looking for Jack to thank him about his help with the golfing trip, as they all had a great time. Jack said that he was surprised it was approved under the Gifts and Hospitality policy. Steve is shocked as he had never even thought about the policy as he just did what Paul asked him to do.

Topic: Gifts and Hospitality, Intimidation

Potential Issues:
● The approval was not sought, whose responsibility was that?
● Steve felt that he needed to make this happen and made assumptions about what others had done. Was he right in doing “just as he was told”?
● Possible conflict of interest with Jack making arrangements through his brother-in-law
● Steve made no mention of perhaps “being able to get around it”
● Jack didn’t speak up when he should have done and Seeta, though not party to the event, could and should have been more encouraging to ensure that Steve did raise the concern/seek guidance

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
● Both Steve and Jack knew that certain things needed to be done and incorrectly assumed someone else had done them, without checking or asking
● All employees are responsible for being aware of and holding themselves and others accountable to our policies. In this kind of situation, it means raising concerns or questions when we are unsure
● The Company will always support employees who report concerns honestly and in good faith, with no tolerance for retaliation
● Offering or giving any benefit to anyone may be construed as a bribe, whether customer, supplier or partner. Steve and Jack are responsible for knowing what their business guidance allows as well as ensuring that an offer does not put the potential receiver in violation of their own organisation’s policies

What actually happened?
In the real case, the issue was discovered after the expense report was submitted. It was also found during the course of the investigation that the expense report was not accurate and contained a number of discrepancies. It was determined that the expense report was unallowable and not reimbursed. The employees were left to pay for the hospitality out of their own pockets. Both the manager and employee received final written warnings through the disciplinary process.

Policy Reference:
● Gifts and Hospitality Policy
● People Policy
SCENARIO THREE: IT’S JUST GOLF

Characters: Paul: Programme Manager; Steve: Direct Report – Team Member; Jack: Direct Report – Team Member.

SUPERVISOR/PEOPLE MANAGER

Scene 1: In a meeting Paul, the Programme Manager, is discussing the new DriveDeep project and that the customer is visiting for acceptance testing and training. Paul wants to make a good impression with them and tells Steve that he would like him to take the lead and arrange some entertainment for them and that he needs to “make it happen”. Steve agrees to do this. Paul then asks Steve about the progress on temporary phones for the customer. Steve explains that this was not approved as per the policy. Paul is frustrated and can’t believe it. Steve is left feeling like he failed. Later on in the week, Paul and Steve are in a meeting. Paul is congratulating Steve on a great job with a golfing trip that he had organised as entertainment for the customer and said that there “might be something in it” for Steve. Steve then tells Paul that although it went really well the approval request had been rejected. He hadn’t thought about that before the event, as he didn’t want to disappoint Paul again. Paul is amazed and quickly says that he didn’t say not to follow policy and asks if he needs to do everything himself. Steve is unsure what to do next.

Topic: Gifts and Hospitality, Intimidation

Potential Issues:

- Paul, in the way that he communicated with Steve and the language that he used, such as “make it happen” led Steve to believe that he was under pressure to succeed and had Paul’s permission to do whatever it took. How should Paul have handled it?
- Paul’s reaction to the bad news about the mobile phones left Steve feeling that he had failed, even though he had done the right thing. How should he have responded?
- Steve believes that he did exactly what he was asked to do about the entertainment and so doesn’t think that he did anything wrong – did he?

Overall Key Points: Things to consider

- As a Manager Paul is responsible for setting a tone of respect for the company’s policies and procedures – using directing language without ensuring understanding can lead to misinterpretation and mis-understanding
- Paul also has to show leadership by being open to bad news as well as good and by helping Steve work towards a solution to the problem they face
- Offering or giving any benefit to anyone may be construed as a bribe, whether customer, supplier or partner. Steve and Jack are responsible for knowing what their business guidance allows as well as ensuring that an offer does not put the potential receiver in violation of their own organisation’s policies
- Guidance and approval should have been sought before arranging the event – who was responsible for that?

What actually happened?

In the real case, the issue was discovered after the expense report was submitted. It was also found during the course of the investigation that the expense report was not accurate and contained a number of discrepancies. It was determined that the expense report was unallowable and not reimbursed. The employees were left to pay for the hospitality out of their own pockets. Both the manager and employee received written warnings.

Policy Reference:

- Gifts and Hospitality Policy
- People Policy
SCENARIO FOUR: SOCIAL NETWORK

Characters: Jessica: Manager; Jim: Direct Report – Team Member; Kate: Direct Report – New Team Member.

EMPLOYEE
Scene 1: Kate, a new engineer, is typing away on a social networking site when Jim, her colleague approaches. Jim asks Kate where she is on the task that they were given this morning in the team meeting. Kate says that she has not started it yet as her friend had posted an issue on Facebook that she needs help with and, as she had experience with a similar issue, was having an online conversation with her about it. Kate said that some of her other friends had made fun of her friend Lucy for posting it, saying she should be able to figure it out herself, so Kate wanted to help. Jim said he was not sure that Kate should be communicating in that way on Facebook. Kate said she wasn’t concerned as it is just her friends and she hadn’t posted any documents. Jessica, their Manager, approaches and asks Kate if she was going to the canteen, Jim walks away.

Topic: Social Networking, Time Charging and Proprietary Information

Potential Issues:
- Kate is spending a significant amount of work time on a social networking site – is any time allowed?
- Kate may be posting information that could be proprietary to the Company, or at least competition-sensitive and has not considered the potential consequences of her actions
- Jim is not happy about raising his concerns given that Kate and Jessica appear to be close
- Time that Kate has spent on-line is time that should have been spent on the task – which is where her time is being charged

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
- The Company allows reasonable personal-use of our IT facilities, but what does reasonable mean?
- All information posted on social media is much more widely accessible than most of us think or would believe, even if deleted at a later date
- Sharing of business related information, especially if it is proprietary or sensitive, poses extreme risks to the Company and, potentially, others

What actually happened?
This scenario is made up from a number of different cases. The employees involved were dealt with appropriately through the disciplinary process. Where an employee is sharing proprietary or sensitive information and/or is spending more than a reasonable amount of time using IT facilities for their own purposes and/or during work hours it is possible that they will be dismissed.

Policy Reference:
- IT Acceptable Use Policy
- Finance Policy
- Intellectual Property Policy
Characters: Jessica: Manager; Abdul: Manager (Jessica’s peer);

SUPERVISOR/PEOPLE MANAGER

Scene 1: Abdul and Jessica are having a conversation and Jessica asks Abdul for some advice. She has a situation where one of her new team members, Kate is posting a lot of information on Facebook, which Jessica has seen and she believes could be considered proprietary information or at least competition-sensitive. Jessica has become close friends with Kate, not only at work but also socially with their families getting together at weekends. She is unsure of how to approach Kate about this situation, as she doesn’t want it to damage their friendship.

Topic: Social Networking, Time Charging and Proprietary Information

Potential Issues:
- Jessica, as a Line Manager has befriended one of her direct reports – is this a good situation to be in and what are the implications for Jessica?
- Kate is spending too much time on Facebook rather than working on the task – how is such time measured and what is acceptable?
- If Kate is sharing information that she should not be, how can that be determined and how will it be recovered?

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
- Jessica now has a situation that she knows has to be dealt with but finds herself conflicted between business and personal needs
- The Company allows reasonable personal-use of our IT facilities, but what does reasonable mean?
- Social media can be powerful as a business-enhancing tool – but how do we know when it is the right or wrong time to use it?

What actually happened?
This scenario is made up from a number of different cases. The employees involved were dealt with appropriately through the disciplinary process. Where an employee is sharing proprietary or sensitive information and/or is spending more than a reasonable amount of time using IT facilities for their own purposes and/or during work hours it is possible that they will be dismissed.

Policy Reference:
- IT Acceptable Use Policy
- Finance Policy
- Intellectual Property Policy
SCENARIO FIVE: SURPRISE VISIT


EMPLOYEE
Scene 1: Jane, a Supervisor, is having her regular status meeting by phone with Catherine her Manager. Jane mentions that she is having a performance issue with one of the team members, Richard. She has heard that he is constantly coming in late, sometimes half a day late without her knowing and that other team members have to pick up his work. Jane says that she is going to do a surprise visit the following week. When Jane arrives on site early the following week she is surprised to see Richard at his desk. Later that day, during a meeting that Jane has with Sophie, another of her team members, Sophie mentions that Richard and Catherine may be in a relationship. Jane had no idea.

Topic: Conflicts of Interest, Respect of Others

Potential Issues:
- Catherine’s alleged relationship with Richard could be a conflict of interest given they are in the same reporting line
- For whatever his reasons are for his lateness, it means that others are having to cover his work
- Sophie might be spreading a malicious rumour rather than fact out of resentment
- There is a performance issue with Richard’s lateness and him not informing his manager of when and the reasons why

Overall Key Points: Things to consider
- Where employees are aware that the behaviours of others are not acceptable and they impact others, they should be reporting it rather than covering it up – even with good intent
- When receiving information that is possible hearsay it is important not to react to it as if it were fact
- The Company will always support employees who report concerns honestly and in good faith, with no tolerance for retaliation

What actually happened?
During the course of the investigation the parties lied, tried to destroy evidence and collaborated in fabricating a story to explain the evidence. As a result both the Manager and the employee were dismissed. It is important to note that the relationship between the Manager and the employee, had it been declared, it could have been managed and resolved as a conflict of interest without becoming a major issue. But it was their actions when they were confronted that caused their dismissal.

Policy Reference:
- Conflicts of interest Policy
- People Policy
**SCENARIO FIVE: SURPRISE VISIT**

**Characters:** Jane: Manager; Gordon: Manager (peer of Jane); Catherine: Director.

**SUPERVISOR/PEOPLE MANAGER**

**Scene 1:** Jane, a Supervisor, meets with Gordon, also a Supervisor, to talk to him about one of her team members, Richard. She has been having some attendance and performance issues with Richard and says that she has heard from other employees that they cover his work when he isn’t there. There is also suggestion that he is in a romantic relationship with Catherine, their own Manager. Jane is concerned that Catherine may be ignoring the performance issue when she mentions it. Jane, starting early, made a surprise visit to the site and unexpectedly found Richard was there already and stayed late that day too. Jane is suspicious that Catherine tipped off Richard about her visit. What should she do? Gordon says that Jane should speak with Catherine directly. Jane said that she tried that and Catherine didn’t deny the relationship and said that she wasn’t doing anything wrong; lots of staff have relationships, apparently.

**Topic: Conflicts of Interest, Respect of Others**

**Potential Issues:**
- At the moment Jane only has hearsay about the relationship, Catherine’s non-denial is not admission
- If there is a relationship it could be seen by others that Richard is receiving favouritism because of a relationship with Catherine
- If there is a relationship then how can Jane get the support she needs to effectively manage the performance issues?
- What information does Jane need about Richard's attendance and how can she get it?

**Overall Key Points: Things to consider**
- When receiving information that is possible hearsay or gossip it is important not to react to it as if it were fact
- It is possible that the relationship story is just that – borne out of perception and resentment of his colleagues for the fact that Richard appears to be getting away with it – so he must therefore be receiving favouritism
- When a relationship does start in the workplace, who is responsible for declaring/reporting it?
- Differentiating and defining the issues is important so that they can be dealt with separately – but in what order and by whom?

**What actually happened?**

During the course of the investigation the parties lied, tried to destroy evidence and collaborated in fabricating a story to explain the evidence. As a result both the Manager and the employee were dismissed. It is important to note that if the relationship between the Manager and the employee, had been declared, it could have been managed and resolved as a conflict of interest without becoming a major issue. But it was their actions when they were confronted that caused their dismissal.

**Policy Reference:**
- Conflicts of interest Policy
- People Policy