



SEAX TRUST GDPR Freedom of Information (FOI) Policy



GDPR – FREEDOM OF INFORMATION POLICY

Other Policies relating to this Policy:

Freedom of Information Publication Scheme

Effective Date of Adoption:	24th June 2026
Review Date:	Every Two Years
Publication:	For publication on the Trust Website

This is a **Trust** Policy covering all SEAX Trust Provisions, ratified by **Resources, Audit & Risk Committee** on behalf of the Board of Trustees

For publication on School & Trust websites.

This is a new Trust Policy following audit advice from DPO (SBM Services) June 2026

SBM Services - Version History

V26.1	June 2026	Appendix A added: guidance for requesters on submitting an FOI
V19.1	February 2019	Document created

This template has been provided by SBM Services (uk) Ltd and is only authorised for use by those schools in contract with SBM Services (uk) Ltd. This template may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of SBM Services (uk) Ltd.

Copyright © 2026 All rights reserved

GDPR: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION POLICY

Introduction

The SEAX Trust is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOI) as a public authority, and as such, must comply with any requests for information in accordance with the principles laid out in the Act.

We are also required to provide an approved publication scheme of the types of class of information which the Trust holds. This document is published on the Trust website.

What is a FOI request?

Any request for any information from the SEAX Trust or one of its Academies is technically a request under FOI, whether or not the individual making the request mentions 'FOI'. However, the ICO has stated that routine requests for information (such as a parent requesting a copy of a policy) can be dealt with outside of the provisions of the Act.

In all non-routine cases, if the request is simple and the information is to be released, then the individual who received the request can release the information, but must ensure that this is done within the timescale set out below. A copy of the request and response should then be sent to the GDPR Lead at the relevant Academy or Central Team.

All other requests should be referred in the first instance to the relevant Headteacher (GDPR Lead for the Central Team) who may allocate another individual to deal with the request. This must be done promptly, and in any event within **3 working days** of receiving the request.

When considering a request under FOI, a release under FOI is treated as release to the general public, and so, once it has been released to an individual, anyone can then access it. Access cannot be restricted when releasing the information by marking it "confidential" or "restricted".

Time Limit for Compliance


The Academy/Central Team must respond as soon as possible, and in any event, within **20 working days** of the date of receipt of the request. A "working day" is one in which pupils are in attendance, subject to an absolute maximum of 60 calendar days to respond.

Procedure for Dealing with a Request

When a request is received which cannot be dealt with by simply providing the information, it should be referred in the first instance to the relevant Headteacher (GDPR Lead for the Central Team) who may re-allocate to an individual with responsibility for the type of information requested.

First Stage

The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) 'Request Handling Flowchart' (extract pictured below) provides an overview of the steps to follow when handling a request for information.



The first stage in responding is to determine whether or not the Academy/Central Team “holds” the information requested.

The Academy/Central Team will hold the information if it exists in computer or paper format. Some requests will require the Academy/Central Team to take information from different sources and manipulate it in some way. Where this would take minimal effort, the Academy/Central Team is considered to “hold” that information, but if the required manipulation would take a significant amount of time, the requestor should be contacted to explain that the information is not held in the manner requested and offer the opportunity to refine their request.

For example, if a request required the Academy/Central Team to add up totals in a spreadsheet and release the total figures, this would be information “held” by the Academy/Central Team. If the Academy/Central Team would have to go through a number of spreadsheets and identify individual figures and provide a total, this is likely **not** to be information “held” by the Academy/Central Team, depending on the time involved in extracting the information.

If the information requested is not held, the requestor should be contacted in writing to explain that the information is not held.

Before deciding that the Academy/Central Team does not hold any recorded information, the person dealing with the request should make sure that they have carried out adequate and properly directed searches, and that there are convincing reasons for concluding that no recorded information is held. If a requestor subsequently complains to the ICO that the Academy/Central Team has not identified all of the information that it holds, the ICO will consider the scope, quality and thoroughness of the searches that were undertaken and test the strength of the Academy/Central Team’s reasoning and conclusions.

Second Stage

The second stage is to decide whether the information can be released, or whether one of the exemptions set out in the Act applies to the information. Common exemptions that might apply include:

- Section 40 (1) – the request is for the applicants’ personal data. This must be dealt with under the subject access regime in the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA), detailed in paragraph 9 of the GDPR Data Protection Policy;
- Section 40 (2) – compliance with the request would involve releasing third party personal data, and this would be in breach of the DPA principles as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the GDPR Data Protection Policy;
- Section 41 – information that has been sent to the Academy/Central Team but not the Academy/Central Team’s own information) which is confidential;
- Section 21 – information that is already publicly available, even if payment of a fee is required to access that information;
- *Section 22 – information that the Academy/Central Team intends to publish at a future date;*
- *Section 43 – information that would prejudice the commercial interests of the Trust and/or a third party;*
- *Section 38 – information that could prejudice the physical health, mental health or safety of an individual (this may apply particularly to safeguarding information);*
- *Section 31 – information which may prejudice the effective detection and prevention of crime – such as the location of CCTV cameras;*
- *Section 36 – information which, in the opinion of the Chair of the Board of Trustees would prejudice the effective conduct of the Trust. There is a special form for this on the ICO’s website to assist with obtaining the Chair’s opinion.*

Note: The sections mentioned in italics are qualified exemptions. This means that even if the exemption applies to the information, a public interest weighting exercise must also be carried out, balancing the public interest in the information being released, as against the public interest in withholding the information.

Responding to a Request:

1. If the information is held

If the information being requested is held, there are a number of ways that the information can be made available to the requestor, including by email, as a printed copy or by arranging for the requestor to view the information. The information should be sent by whatever means is most reasonable, however, requestors have the right to specify their preferred means of communication, in their initial request. The original request should be checked for any preferences before sending out the information.

If the information being requested is included in the publication scheme, this information can be given out automatically, or a link provided to the requestor where the information can be accessed, such as the relevant page on the Academy/Trust website.

If the requestor has made their request by email, and the information is an electronic document in a standard form, then it would be reasonable to reply by email and attach the information.

2. If some or all of the information has been withheld

When responding to a request where the Academy/Central Team has withheld some or all of the information, the Academy/Central Team must explain why the information has been withheld, quoting the appropriate section number and explaining how the information requested fits within that exemption. If the public interest test has been applied, this also needs to be explained.

The letter should end by explaining to the requestor how they can complain – by writing to the relevant Headteacher (CEO for the Central Team) within 20 working days of the response being

received, giving reasons for the appeal. A review will then be carried out internally by someone not involved in the original decision, usually at Central Team (Committee for the Central Team) level.

3. If the information is not held

The FOI Act only covers information that is held. If the information that the requestor has asked for is not held, the Academy/Central Team can comply with the request by informing the requestor in writing that the information is not held (subject to adequate searches for the information having been undertaken as per the requirements set out in the 'First Stage' section of this document).

CONTACT

Any questions about this policy should be directed in the first instance to the relevant Headteacher (CEO for the Central Team).

Appendix A

Guidance for Requesters

If you are using AI to help draft information requests

AI tools can be helpful, but they can also introduce errors or create overly complex requests that increase the burden on public bodies and cost to the taxpayer.

When using AI to help draft an information request, please make sure the final wording has been checked and reflects your actual information needs.

Before you submit a request or secondary correspondence, please check that:

- **You are only asking for the information you are genuinely looking for.**

AI tools sometimes generate broad or excessive wording that goes beyond the information you actually want or need;

- **The request is clear, concise and focused.**

Short, straightforward requests are easier for us to process and usually lead to quicker, more accurate responses;

- **There are no obvious factual inaccuracies.**

AI can misrepresent legislation or mis-state what organisations do. Please review the text of your request carefully and don't assume AI is right. If it has referred to something you don't understand, check what it is; and that

- **The tone is appropriate.**

AI-generated content can sometimes sound abrupt, or otherwise inappropriate. Please check the tone before sending.

Why does this matter?

We are seeing an increase in requests and secondary correspondence that appear to have been drafted by generative AI. These can require additional clarification because of inaccuracies or unnecessary complexity. This creates delays for both requesters and our teams.