



social care
institute for excellence

Canterbury Cathedral independent safeguarding audit (November 2018)



The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) improves the lives of people who use care services by sharing knowledge about what works.

We are a leading improvement support agency and an independent charity working with adults', families' and children's care and support services across the UK. We also work closely with related services such as health care and housing.

We improve the quality of care and support services for adults and children by:

- identifying and sharing knowledge about what works and what's new
- supporting people who plan, commission, deliver and use services to put that knowledge into practice
- informing, influencing and inspiring the direction of future practice and policy.

First published in Great Britain in February 2019
by the Social Care Institute for Excellence and the Church of England

© Church of England

All rights reserved

Written by Hugh Constant, Susan Ellery and Sheila Fish

Social Care Institute for Excellence

Watson House
54 Baker Street
London W1U 7EX
tel 020 7766 7400
www.scie.org.uk



Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 | The audit programme..... | 1 |
| 1.2 | About SCIE..... | 1 |
| 1.3 | The audit process..... | 1 |
| 2 | CONTEXT..... | 3 |
| 2.1 | Context of the Cathedral..... | 3 |
| 2.2 | Contextual features relevant to safeguarding..... | 3 |
| 2.3 | Description of the safeguarding structure (including links with the diocese)..... | 4 |
| 2.4 | Who was seen in this audit | 4 |
| 3 | Findings – Practice | 5 |
| 3.1 | Safe activities and working practices | 5 |
| 3.2 | Case work (including information sharing) | 12 |
| 3.3 | Clergy Disciplinary Measure | 15 |
| 3.4 | Training | 15 |
| 3.5 | Safer Recruitment..... | 16 |
| 4 | Findings – organisational supports | 18 |
| 4.1 | Policy, procedures and guidance | 18 |
| 4.2 | Cathedral safeguarding advisor, and their supervision & management..... | 19 |
| 4.3 | Recording systems and IT solutions..... | 21 |
| 5 | FINDINGS – LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY | 23 |
| 5.1 | Quality Assurance..... | 23 |
| 5.2 | Complaints about the safeguarding service | 24 |
| 5.3 | Whistleblowing | 25 |
| 5.4 | Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel..... | 25 |
| 5.5 | Leadership and management..... | 27 |
| 6 | Conclusions..... | 31 |
| | APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS | 32 |
| | DATA COLLECTION..... | 32 |

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE AUDIT PROGRAMME

The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) is conducting an independent audit of the safeguarding arrangements of the cathedrals of the Church of England. This programme of work will see all the Church of England's cathedrals audited between late 2018 and early 2021. It represents an important opportunity to support improvement in safeguarding.

All cathedrals are unique, and differ in significant ways from a diocese. SCIE has drawn on its experience of auditing all 42 Church of England dioceses, and adapted it, using discussions and preliminary meetings with different cathedral chapters, to design an audit methodology fit for cathedrals. We have sought to balance cathedrals' diversity with the need for adequate consistency across the audits, to make the audits comparable, but sufficiently bespoke to support progress in effective and timely safeguarding practice in each separate cathedral.

1.2 ABOUT SCIE

The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) improves the lives of people who use care services by sharing knowledge about what works. We are a leading improvement support agency and an independent charity working with adults', families' and children's care and support services across the UK. We also work closely with related services such as health care and housing.

Safeguarding is one of our areas of expertise, for both adults and children. We have completed an independent safeguarding audit of diocesan arrangements across the Church of England as well as supporting safeguarding in other faith contexts. We are committed to co-producing our work with people with lived experience of receiving services.

1.3 THE AUDIT PROCESS

1.3.1 SCIE Learning Together and our approach to audit

SCIE has pioneered a particular approach to conducting case reviews and audits in child and adult safeguarding that is collaborative in nature. It is called Learning Together and has proved valuable in the adults' and children's safeguarding fields. It builds on work in the engineering and health sectors that shows that improvement is more likely if remedies target the underlying causes of difficulties, and so uses audits and reviews to generate that kind of understanding. So Learning Together involves exploring and sharing understanding of both the causes of problems and the reasons why things go well.

1.3.2 Key principles informing the audit

Drawing on SCIE's Learning Together model, the following principles underpin the approach we take to the audits:

- Working collaboratively: the audits done 'with you, not to you'
- Highlighting areas of good practice as well as problematic issues
- Focusing on understanding the reasons behind inevitable problems in safeguarding
- No surprises: being open and transparent about our focus, methods and findings so nothing comes out of the blue
- Distinguishing between unique local challenges and underlying issues that impact on all or many cathedrals

1.3.3 Supporting improvements

The overarching aim of each audit is to support safeguarding improvements. To this end our goal is to understand the safeguarding progress of each cathedral to date. We set out to move from understanding how things work in each cathedral, to evaluating how well they are working. This includes exploring the reasons behind identified strengths and weaknesses. Our conclusions will pose questions for the cathedral leadership to consider in attempting to tackle the underlying causes of deficiencies.

SCIE methodology does not conclude findings with recommendations. We instead give the cathedral questions to consider in relation to the findings, as they decide how best to tackle the issue at hand. The Learning Together approach requires those with local knowledge and responsibility for improving practice to have a key role in deciding what exactly to do to address the findings and to be accountable for their decisions. It has the additional benefit of helping to foster ownership locally of the work to be done to improve safeguarding.

1.3.4 Structure of the report

This report is divided into:

- Introduction
- The findings of the audit presented per theme
- Questions for the cathedral to consider are listed, where relevant, at the end of each Findings section
- Conclusions of the auditors' findings: what is working well and areas for further development
- An appendix sets out the audit process and any limitations to this audit

2 CONTEXT

2.1 CONTEXT OF THE CATHEDRAL

The leadership in each cathedral, as part of the audit process, was asked to supply a brief description of the institution. Canterbury Cathedral's is here:

Canterbury Cathedral is a church of local, national and global significance. It is a major destination for visitors, a focus for the community of East Kent, a local employer (with over 360 paid staff), and it has a significant economic influence on the area. It is a centre of excellence in crafts such as stonemasonry and stained glass work, and in choral music.

Locally the Cathedral is the hub of the diocese of Canterbury, a network of more than three hundred local churches spread across every community in East Kent. Nationally it has been the seat of the Archbishop of Canterbury ever since St Augustine landed on the shores of Kent in AD 597. Globally it is a mother church, regarded as a spiritual home by the 85 million Christians of the Anglican Communion worldwide.

Canterbury Cathedral, a Grade I listed feat of architectural genius, is a global focus for Anglican worshippers. The Mother Church of the Anglican Communion and seat of the Archbishop of Canterbury, it attracts over a million visitors each year as a holy place and as part of a World Heritage Site.

2.2 CONTEXTUAL FEATURES RELEVANT TO SAFEGUARDING

Canterbury Cathedral, as an institution, is on a different scale from nearly all other English cathedrals. The numbers of visitors, staff and volunteers mean that huge volumes of people have to be kept safe, and achieving clarity about who does what becomes proportionately more difficult. Conversely, its very size affords it dedicated capacity – it is large enough to have specialist safeguarding and welfare roles, and is well-resourced. Its size and global prominence make it a potential terrorist target, and much of the thinking around security and safety is with this in mind. One impact of the measures taken to counter any terrorist threat is that the Cathedral is generally experienced as a safe place.

Canterbury Cathedral sits within walled precincts, protected by a team of Close Constables with police powers. Gates in the walls meant that unlike most cathedrals, the precincts can be closed off from the rest of the city. Within the precincts there are a number of different buildings with different functions. There is accommodation for senior clergy, a hotel, a conference centre, an education centre, and other departments that go to make up a varied and complex organisation.

Canterbury Cathedral is linked with St. Edmund's School, situated a little out of the city, which its boy choristers attend. Boy choristers spend their term-times boarding in Choir House, within the Cathedral precincts, and commute daily to school by

minibus. There is also a girls' choir. There is no boarding arrangement for girls. The Cathedral is linked too with King's School, which is located next to the Cathedral, and where the Dean of Canterbury is chair of governors. This audit is of Canterbury Cathedral, and not the schools, although it does cover how the boundaries between the Cathedral and the schools work in safeguarding terms.

2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE SAFEGUARDING STRUCTURE (INCLUDING LINKS WITH THE DIOCESE)

Canterbury Cathedral Chapter, headed by the Dean of Canterbury, has overall responsibility for safeguarding, as for all aspects of Cathedral life. Safeguarding is overseen by the Safeguarding Management Group, being renamed the Safeguarding Advisory Panel, to better reflect its function.

Reflecting its size and significance, Canterbury Cathedral has its own Cathedral Safeguarding Adviser (CSA), distinct from the local Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser. The CSA is an independent consultant, working for the Cathedral as and when necessary, but typically for about two days per week. As a consultant, she reports to the Head of HR, but has no line manager in a traditional sense within the Cathedral. She is accountable to Chapter.

Cooperation and joint working between the Cathedral and Diocese is good and developing across safeguarding work. The diocesan office is cheek by jowl with the Cathedral precincts. The CSA currently also works, on a separate contract, for the Diocese, and key personnel know each well, and see each regularly. There are also strong clerical links which strengthen joint working on safeguarding. The relationship is formalised in a Memorandum of Understanding. Currently Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, cover for the CSA, and information systems are all areas in which the two bodies are working together. Both institutions have an ambition for a shared Safeguarding Advisory Panel (see 5.4).

2.4 WHO WAS SEEN IN THIS AUDIT

In the course of the site visit the auditors spoke to all those in the safeguarding structure described above, strategic safeguarding leads, and key people leading a wide range of activities involving children and adults in the Cathedral, and with a duty therefore to keep them safe. Further details are provided in the appendix. The audit of Canterbury Cathedral, as a large institution, involved a three-day site visit; most cathedrals have a 2.5-day audit.

2.4.1 Any limitations to audit

Canterbury's audit was well-planned, despite being the first of the cathedral audit programme, and having relatively little time to prepare. Significant time and effort had gone into preparation, allowing it to run smoothly. This was reflective of Canterbury's commitment to the audit, and the open-minded, positive approach they took to it. There were, therefore, no limitations to the audit process.

3 Findings – Practice

3.1 SAFE ACTIVITIES AND WORKING PRACTICES

There are significant challenges to running a place of worship that receives over a million visitors a year and is open to the public, some of whom may be vulnerable themselves, or a possible risk to others. The auditors concluded that Canterbury Cathedral has in place the personnel and systems to manage its safeguarding risks well. Further detail is provided below.

3.1.1 Precincts and buildings

Description

During the day, entrance is controlled through a small number of gates, each staffed by Close Constables and others, such as shepherds. The Close Constables are, when fully-staffed, a team of 24 people, led by the Security & Fire Manager, and well-trained in safeguarding as well as wider security matters. Central to the role is to meet and greet people, speak to the public, and to be part of the general welcome the Cathedral offers.

The Close Constables are supplemented by armed police, whose role is focused on terrorism prevention, but whose presence adds to a sense that the precincts are generally well-guarded. The Constables are present at some services. The Close Constables also have strong links with Kent Police.

Around the precincts, there are also visitor guides, tour staff and others; within the Cathedral building, there are lay chaplains on duty, as well as other clerics, virgers, and – during services – stewards.

Analysis

In managing the numbers of visitors and range of activities in the Cathedral precincts and across the different buildings, the ability to physically control access to the precincts, and the mixed economy of personnel detailed above serve to create a safe environment for visitors. There is an overall sense that the Cathedral, its precincts and various buildings are well-guarded and secure.

The only vulnerability in this set-up identified during the audit, relates to the integration of the hotel into the whole. Auditors were told that while most staff in the precincts alert each other if there are people of concern around and about, people in the hotel are isolated from that.

In addition to being well-guarded, the environment also means that no-one is likely to be far from someone to whom they can turn to for assistance, including if they need help to keep safe or want to raise safeguarding concerns.

There also seem to be well-established and understood protocols for the range of staff to respond to different potential scenarios. Volunteers have ‘What do I do if...?’ cards, setting out their responsibilities in different circumstances, such as finding a

lost child, or a person with dementia. All staff and volunteers carry a yellow card with contact details for the CSA and other safeguarding leads. The Close Constables have offered emergency safety briefings to choristers, staff and volunteers.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Is there a reliable enough mechanism for alerting staff throughout the precinct, in all buildings, including the hotel, of any safeguarding risks e.g. a formal, all-staff email alert system or similar for use if there is a concern about someone?
- Is there a role for the Canon Missioner to be involved as a signatory to Safeguarding Agreements?

3.1.2 Vulnerable adults

Description

Within the high numbers of visitors, there are many adults who have additional vulnerabilities and are, or are at risk of, abuse and neglect, including self-neglect and self-harm.

A number of people in volunteer roles within the Cathedral fall into this category by virtue, for example, of declining cognitive function as they age.

Analysis

The auditors were struck by the way in which Canterbury Cathedral succeeds in acting as a welcoming, compassionate community to all, including vulnerable adults. The Cathedral functions as a regular place of refuge for visitors with vulnerabilities who have become well-known to Cathedral staff and volunteers. Where there are concerns about people, Cathedral staff are able to refer them to appropriate statutory and voluntary agencies, if they cannot meet their immediate needs themselves.

People in the Cathedral deal with situations where pastoral care and safeguarding issues are intertwined and change over time, and so are not clear cut. In the context of Canterbury, with the scale of visitors and wide range of roles in which clergy, staff and volunteers get involved in supporting vulnerable people, this is challenging. It creates the need for clear processes for:

- recording, and clarity about the appropriate level of detail to record
- reporting lines and requirements internally
- risk assessing and decision-making about when a referral to statutory agencies.

The audit process highlighted some areas that create vulnerabilities to routinely good safeguarding responses:

a) Clergy in the Cathedral. For clergy the proper pastoral care of people in need is at the very heart of their identity, increasing the risk that safeguarding issues are normalised as part of the pastoral need being tended to. But currently there is no routine oversight and risk assessment by the CSA of regular, well-known people with vulnerabilities.

b) Lay chaplains. Ordained ministers are available to people in the Cathedral for whatever pastoral needs they may have, on a rota basis. They are a key contact for vulnerable adults. However, as they are appointed and receive their training in their parishes, they may be working to slightly different expectations. Currently, there seems to be a gap between some lay chaplains and the CSA, with no routine means of linking them in to the way Canterbury Cathedral manages safeguarding.

c) Various staff and volunteers around the Cathedral. These may be called on to address a situation with a vulnerable adult. The audit identified that while people were clear about what to do in emergencies, there was a degree of uncertainty about what to do in less high-pressure situations. Here reporting lines seemed muddier, with people unclear as to which situations would best go to the CSA, and which to members of the clergy, and which concerns should be logged.

Another complex area is the question of volunteers who themselves are vulnerable. Again, the ethos of supporting and welcoming people appeared to be strong, with efforts made to include people in volunteer roles for as long as felt appropriate, and as long as it gave that person a sense of purpose. Only when a person's presence becomes actively detrimental to the safe running of the Cathedral are people supported, gently and compassionately it appears, to retire.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Does the new senior role of Canon Missioner provide the opportunity to clarify the interface between safeguarding responses and pastoral support to vulnerable adult visitors to the Cathedral?
- Do job descriptions of both Canon Missioner and CSA include the need to work closely together?
- What systems and processes need to be put in place to clarify how communication and referrals between the Canon Missioner and CSA are managed, what recording of interactions is appropriate, and when statutory services should be involved?
- How can the Cathedral support its lay chaplains to address safeguarding issues in line with other people in and around the cathedral?
- How can staff and volunteers have greater clarity as to which concerns should be reported to whom – e.g. flowcharts, bespoke training – and what they need to record?

3.1.3 Children

Children are treated as inherently vulnerable in law, and so the blurred boundary issue that besets the safeguarding of vulnerable adults does not apply; everyone clearly understands that all children must be kept safe. Reflecting that, the auditors found the processes in place to safeguarding visiting children – worshippers, Sunday Club users, servers and other people assisting with services, and the tens of thousands of school visitors – clear and robust.

Description

About 80,000 school children visit Canterbury Cathedral each year, of which c.65,000 are from overseas.

Sunday Club runs during Sunday morning worship, and children attend the start and end of the service, and come to Sunday Club in between. Most children who use Sunday Club are on a register, although people can turn up unannounced. Sunday Club is run by volunteers.

A small number of children act as servers during worship.

Analysis

The schools visits team, staffed in the main by primary school teachers well-versed in safeguarding, have developed clear systems to liaise with schools, especially in the UK, to plan and support visits. Importantly, the welfare of any child on a school visit is primarily the responsibility of the school, not Canterbury Cathedral, and staff are clear therefore that they do not have responsibility *in loco parentis* for the children.

Practical measures which enhance safeguarding include pre-visit conversations with every visiting group; safe staffing ratios and risk assessments from the schools; taking the phone number of group leaders and sharing this with Close Constables; having a protocol of asking people to delete any photographs they take of child visitors; and doing similar preparatory work with the agencies which arrange cathedral visits for overseas schools.

The welfare of children attending Sunday Club, the auditors concluded, receives similar attention. All children have cards with details of emergency contacts, allergies and so forth. Parents have to stay with children under 5, and this supplements the two or three staff on duty and adds to a sense of safety. Sunday Club is not subject to Ofsted monitoring, but it adheres to adult/child ratios set by Ofsted. All volunteers in Sunday Club are DBS checked.

The auditors met a group of children who use Sunday Club and/or are servers during worship. They universally reported feeling safe and happy in their time at Canterbury Cathedral. In discussing who to raise concerns with, it was expressed – albeit only by one child – that there was a worry about looking “silly” if they raised an issue which turned out not to amount to anything.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the Cathedral create a culture where speaking up about a worry is taken for granted as a cultural norm?
- Are there ways in which adults can proactively create opportunities for children to speak up, and overtly seek their views?

3.1.4 Music

Description

Canterbury Cathedral has a boys' choir and a girls' choir. Boy choristers are aged 7–12 and board at Choir House, and attend St. Edmund's School. They practise or perform for c. 20 hours per week, singing in the cathedral six times in most weeks. The Organist & Master of Choristers directs the boys' choir.

During rehearsals of the boys' choir, two of a team of chaperones observe proceedings, and write daily monitoring reports, which are read by the CSA. The chaperones meet the boys at the entrance to the cathedral, and are with them throughout their rehearsal and performance time in the cathedral. The only exception to this is when they put on their robes in the vestry, but there is no access to the room for anyone else in that period.

The boy choristers visit home weekly, which is a recent change, and have access to a wellbeing coach at Choir House, who is 50 per cent funded by Canterbury Cathedral. The boys stay on in Choir House over Christmas and Easter in order to perform, but do not go to school; instead they take part in outings and other activities which are clearly much enjoyed. This is known as boarder choir. Boarder choir in the summer has been reduced from two weeks to one, to allow for more family time.

The girls' choir at Canterbury Cathedral operates differently. The girls are older –12 and above – and come from a range of local schools. They do not board, practise once a week, perform once or twice a month in the cathedral, and do a range of external concerts.

There are three chaperones dedicated to the girls' choir, one of whom is present for each rehearsal, or two if the rehearsal is when the cathedral is open. Two or three go out with the choir for concerts and performances. The director of the girls' choir is also the Assistant Organist, and teaches the probationary boy choristers.

Analysis

All cathedral choirs raise a number of potential safeguarding issues. Young children, sometimes away from home, working towards a highly prized goal all add to the potential for choristers to be groomed by people in positions of trust within the choir context. Secondly, the demands of elite performance can be in tension or conflict with child welfare requirements and expectations. We deal with each in turn below.

Minimising opportunities for grooming and abuse

There is a marked distinction between the boys' and the girls' choir. The girls' choir has been formed in an era of safeguarding awareness. Safeguarding considerations had been thought through thoroughly as part of its establishment. For example, when it was established, the Cathedral ended its programme of organ scholarship for young men, recognising the potential issues of a scholar's close involvement with the girls. The boys' choir, of far longer standing, was not set up in the same context, and recent safeguarding developments have focused on child welfare.

The auditors noted that the chaperone role, for example, is concentrated on welfare issues, and there is no indication that chaperones are considering all potential risks as they carry out their role. There are a number of different aspects to this supervisory role, some but not all of which relate to safeguarding. In relation to the boys' choir particularly, the auditors noted that a vigilance about potential grooming did not appear to be an overt expectation or focus of the chaperones' roles. This was evidenced in the chaperone observation reports.

Risk management on trips abroad is minimal relative to that provided in the cathedral context. Choristers stay in pairs with host families, and the only verification of them is that they are known to the churches the choir is visiting.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Is there a need for a review of the safeguarding aspects of chaperoning arrangements including identifying any gaps when choristers are currently not chaperoned, vigilance to potential grooming and anything else?
- Can any further safeguards and checks be put in place for choir visits abroad?

Promoting child welfare of choristers

In relation to safeguarding in the context of the elite training that goes with becoming a chorister, there is also a marked distinction between the boys' and the girls' choir. The demands of the set-up and schedule are far less for the girls' choir than the boys'.

Steps have been taken in recent years to lessen the pressure on boy choristers, by allowing more time with families, enabling better understanding of their experiences, supporting better integrated working within the Cathedral and between the Cathedral and school, and bolstering the support available to the boys. This includes:

- introducing a wellbeing coach
- increased home visits
- regular liaison meetings between the CSA and Choir House
- excellent pastoral support from Choir House parents, including processes for the lead parent to meet with the Organist & Master of Choristers if a child has been troubled by an interaction
- weekly meetings between the Organist & Master of Choristers with Choir House and St. Edmund's to discuss the pupils

- a mentor for the Organist & Master of Choristers with whom to reflect on his work
- introduction of pupil and parent questionnaires.

The auditors judge these as necessary and important steps. Feedback from choristers' parents was almost unanimous in praise for the care their children receive.

The audit process also raised questions about whether there are outstanding issues regarding the pedagogy employed in the boys' as distinct from the girls' choirs. The girls' choir is described as employing a teaching style which believes that a happy chorister is a successful chorister. There does not seem to be any widely agreed, equivalent value-base in relation to the boys' choir.

This is important in light of feedback received from the boy choristers as part of the audit. The boys whom the auditors met clearly found great pleasures in their lives as choristers, and spoke warmly about camaraderie, trips away, and choral performances. Nonetheless, all did talk in negative terms about the pressure they are put under, and at times being made to feel "bad about yourself", or "like rubbish". Concerns were also raised that feeling ill was frowned upon in choir, and that there was no concern for their well-being if they were poorly. The auditors accept that it is not uncommon for children to be harsh in their judgements about teachers, but the comments were universal, and tally with welfare meetings between the Cathedral and Choir House, in which the children's illnesses and anxieties are discussed. This raises questions for the auditors as to whether more needs to be done, in addition to efforts already made, to prioritise child welfare as it relates to singing in the cathedral.

A clear and agreed value-based position of the priority of child safety and wellbeing in chorister pedagogy is also important in order for the Cathedral to be able to respond proactively to any issues of concern and complaints, including where cultural change is needed. The auditors view the Cathedral's response to a recent complaint as good, but limited to the extent that it aims to monitor a potential problem, so that there is evidence should there be further complaints, rather than one that addresses any underlying custom or practice more proactively.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the Cathedral best take a proactive, value-based stand about the safety and wellbeing of choristers for both boys' and girls' choirs?
- Does the Cathedral need to develop a code of conduct for adults involved in the choir, to include for example adults not attributing nicknames to choristers?
- What can the Cathedral proactively do to ascertain and hear dissenting views of chorister parents, and make it easier for parents to raise safeguarding issues if they diverge from the majority opinion of parents?
- In an environment where the potential rewards for children and their families are substantial, is there sufficient encouragement and opportunity for children

and families to feel safe to raise concerns?

- Are there plans for the pupil and parent questionnaire to be conducted regularly and analysed for trends?

3.1.5 Bell ringing

Description

Canterbury Cathedral has a company of around 30 bell ringers, led by a Tower Captain, in a voluntary role. Of the company, 10–20 typically attend weekly rehearsals and the two ringing sessions each Sunday. Bell ringers can in theory be adults or children but perhaps because of the challenge of ringing in the cathedral, no-one in the company is under 18.

Analysis

Keeping young bell ringers safe and being set up to respond to any safeguarding concerns is an important part of Cathedral responsibilities. This is an underdeveloped area for Canterbury, in part explained by the fact that there are currently no young people in the company.

Bell ringers, including visiting bell ringers, also need to be assessed for any risk they might pose to others in the Cathedral. We report on safer recruitment for permanent members of the company below (3.5). There are few routine safety checks for guest ringers. This means that a ringer with a safeguarding agreement in another cathedral could visit without any risk assessment being conducted.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Given the possibility of young people joining the company, does Canterbury need associated safeguarding policies in place?
- What processes would best secure routine safeguarding checks for visiting bell ringers?

3.2 CASE WORK (INCLUDING INFORMATION SHARING)

3.2.1 Effectiveness of responses

When safeguarding concerns are brought to the CSA, a timely response is needed to make sense of the situation, assess any risk and decide if any action needs to be taken, including whether statutory services need to be informed. In the Cathedral context, this includes helping to distinguish whether there are safeguarding elements to the situations of people receiving pastoral support.

The auditors looked at six case files. The CSA classifies all individual queries with which she deals as cases. The safeguarding practice evidenced in them was good. Judgements were typically sound, and responses were prompt. There was evidence of good cooperation with statutory agencies, and this was reflected in feedback sent to SCIE by the police, and children's and adults' workers at Kent County Council.

The issue of needing to better manage the interface of pastoral and safeguarding issues was articulated earlier in the report and is important to enable appropriate information logging and sharing by clergy, staff and volunteers alike.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- These are addressed in the section on vulnerable adults.

3.2.2 Effectiveness of risk assessments, safeguarding agreements and the risk management plan

Safeguarding Agreements are a key mechanism to support offenders who wish to attend church, to do so safely. They should be underpinned by a risk assessment that details the risks posed by a worshipper, the measures in place to manage those risks, and therefore the reasons for the Safeguarding Agreement. Having a clear rationale for any restrictions helps people enforce the agreements with the appropriate level of diligence.

The auditors looked at both the Safeguarding Agreements the Cathedral has, and judged them as limited in that while they are clear as to the restrictions in place on the individual, they lack underpinning risk assessments. This increases the risks that the rationale for the restrictions gets lost over time, undermining the vigilance with which its implementation is monitored. It makes for a less meaningful review, or one that could ever conclude that the agreement should be terminated.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What priority should be given to reviewing safeguarding agreements to include a risk assessment and review plan?

3.2.3 Quality of recording

Good quality recording is essential to being able to make sense of the development of situations over time, to allow cross-referencing between files, and so that others can pick up work as and when necessary, and readily understand what they are dealing with.

Recording in the cases which the auditors saw was good, with detailed – if occasionally discursive – records kept. Many cases files are simply chronological collections of emails, meeting notes etc. All case records are now kept on the Safebase care management system used by the Diocese of Canterbury, and which allows for cross-referencing with other cases and reflective notes to be kept.

Quality of engagement with the people who disclose abuse, share concerns of unsafe people or practice, or ask for help to keep safe for any reason – including use of any targeted resources e.g. Authorised Listeners.

An important part of the audit was speaking to people who had come forward to disclose abuse, share concerns, or expected help from the Cathedral to keep safe for any reason, to find out how timely, compassionate and effective they had found responses and support provided by the Cathedral. The Cathedral made this possible

by identifying people in advance and publicising the audit so that people could contact SCIE.

Two people got in touch to share their views. Their input is used by the auditors to illustrate strengths and vulnerabilities from the perspective of those with first-hand experience. The auditors make no assumptions about those individuals constituting a representative sample of all the people with whom the Cathedral has been in touch regarding safeguarding, or whether the responses they received are representative of other people's experiences. One person was unstinting in praise of the response received. The other had a more mixed view.

Strengths to foster in the quality of engagement with people who disclose abuse or share concerns include:

- professionalism
- promptness
- warmth
- time being committed to the issues raised
- genuine efforts made to engage with the person who had come forward.

Issues to consider further in order to minimise dissatisfaction with how concerns or disclosures are handled include:

- Is there clarity about what, if anything, counts as a legitimate reason NOT to apologise?
- How can language use be monitored to avoid inadvertently conveying a minimising of the issue being raised?
- Making overt when there is a difference of opinion, rather than the opinion of the person not being listened to.
- The appropriateness of venue where meetings are held relative to the concern being raised.
- When an independent element is required to the complaints process. The complaints process will be looked at in more detail in 5.2.

The Cathedral uses a Lessons Learnt reflection process for complex cases, as recommended by the National Safeguarding Team.

Authorised Listeners

Canterbury Cathedral maintains a pool of Authorised Listeners, to whom people can be referred – by the CSA – if they come forward with safeguarding issues. The CSA herself is listed as a Listener, which feels like an unhelpful blurring of roles. More broadly, the Authorised Listeners are rarely used. They appear to be well-qualified and appropriate, and use a Christian ethos in their work. This is an active choice by the Cathedral, to ensure Listeners understand the context in which any concerns are being raised. A wider range of Listeners, including people from a secular background, would offer greater choice for people who may wish to seek support from outside the Church.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the Authorised Listener offer be reframed to appeal to as wide as possible a range of people approaching the Cathedral?

3.3 CLERGY DISCIPLINARY MEASURE

The auditors saw no cases involving the use of the Clergy Disciplinary Measure.

3.4 TRAINING

Training is an important mechanism for establishing safeguarding awareness and confidence throughout the Cathedral. It requires good quality substance with relevant case studies, engaging and pertinent to the audience. It also requires strategic planning to identify who needs what training, and an implementation plan that tracks what training has been provided, who attended, and who still needs to attend or requires refresher sessions.

Description

Canterbury Cathedral requires all staff and volunteers to do safeguarding training, which mean that over 1,000 people, most of whom are volunteers, and some of whom may feel that safeguarding is merely tangential to their role, need to be trained.

Using the House of Bishops' framework, senior staff receive C4 training, heads of department and selected other staff receive C2 training, and all volunteers do the C1 online course.

Much of the training has been done by the main trainer from the diocesan safeguarding staff, and the Canon Pastor.

Analysis

The scale of the training task in Canterbury Cathedral means that a strategic plan for managing the task – who will be trained by when, using what capacity – is needed. Records are kept on the SAGE database for each department, of who has been trained, and who has not been, which could be used to develop a plan.

The auditors heard a good deal of feedback that the C1 course is tailored to the dioceses, and therefore is often irrelevant to the cathedral context. As it is a centrally provided course, Canterbury Cathedral is limited in what it can do to address this, although has given feedback to the National Safeguarding Team.

Feedback on face-to-face training was more positive – very positive in some instances. Case studies pertinent to the Cathedral are used. Concerns were raised about the lack of coverage of confidentiality in C4 training. This, in a small, closed community, was felt to be particularly important for Cathedral staff.

It is positive that sessions are laid on for volunteers and others who cannot tackle online training themselves.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Does more need to be done to develop a strategic plan for the ongoing training demand and delivery plan, including refresher training?
- How can the timing of this planning be linked with finding replacements for the main trainer and Canon Pastor who have both recently left the Cathedral?

3.5 SAFER RECRUITMENT

Barring some slight uncertainty about DBS checks, safe recruitment appears to work well, befitting a large organisation with a well-functioning HR department. Evidence for this included the three recruitment files seen by the auditors, including the file of the new Canon Missioner. As someone with a key pastoral role, the recruitment process for the Canon Missioner included an explicit safeguarding question.

3.5.1 Central record keeping

The HR department at the Cathedral maintains a central record of appointments, including, where necessary, DBS checks. This includes when checks are due for renewal, and a system to flag this in advance, so people can be notified.

The Cathedral archives, uniquely among cathedrals, hold the diocesan clergy Blue Files of deceased clergy. The Diocese occasionally needs to see these, and all requests are handled by the Head of Archives, who is DBS checked.

3.5.2 Volunteer appointments

On the whole, reflecting the prestige of Canterbury Cathedral, there is a steady stream of people wishing to volunteer there, so recruitment for volunteers, in terms of reaching out to people, does not tend to happen.

Some voluntary roles, such as helpers at the Sunday Club, are harder to fill. In the case of Sunday Club, the Archdeacon of Canterbury is to gently encourage volunteers, indicating that there is not a formal recruitment process as such. Sunday Club volunteers are then DBS checked, but the Cathedral needs to satisfy itself that the need to recruit volunteers does not lead to any lowering of safe recruitment standards.

3.5.3 Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)

DBS processes have just been merged with those of the Diocese, with the Diocese taking responsibility for all the Cathedral's checks. As there were no reported issues with the system, this seems to the auditors to be a sensible economy of scale, and an example of closer cooperation with the Diocese.

As a large institution, and one recruiting a significant number of volunteers, there is not complete clarity about who is entitled to a DBS check. Often this is because the DBS itself is changing the rules; for instance volunteer visitor guides used to be eligible, but no longer are. The HR department is looking to develop guidance to help determine who is and is not eligible, and for which level of check.

Many of the roles – in Sunday Club, as chaperone, virgers etc. – clearly need a DBS check, and no problems were reported with the system. The Head of HR reported minimal push back from people who questioned why they were to be checked.

Maintaining a safe environment requires systems to minimise the likelihood that bell ringers in the cathedral could pose a risk. A key mechanism is the DBS check, and at the time of the audit everyone in the company was DBS checked.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can Sunday Club recruitment be enhanced and kept safe?
- Are adequate safeguards in place for people in volunteer posts?

4 Findings – organisational supports

4.1 POLICY, PROCEDURES AND GUIDANCE

Description

Canterbury Cathedral operates to the House of Bishops' policies on safeguarding, including the recent practice guidance *Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies* (2017) which sets out more explicitly than before the safeguarding expectations for cathedrals. The auditors saw no indication of the Cathedral using separate diocesan policies.

Canterbury Cathedral has its own Safeguarding Guidelines for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (2018).

Analysis

Changes are being made in response to national guidance, such as the remodeling of the Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel (see 5.4), which suggests the guidance is taken seriously. There was case evidence of *Responding to, assessing and managing safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers* (2017) being used in practice.

Canterbury's guidelines open with a note from the Dean of Canterbury, which sends a positive message about the weight they should be given, and a list of safeguarding contacts.

They do not feel as if they duplicate national documents; an institution of the Cathedral's size has specific considerations to cover, and most of the document helpfully contextualises national guidelines. They are generally clear and fit for purpose, and the auditors would make the following points:

- Children are described as “essential” to Cathedral life, and vulnerable adults as “involved in” Cathedral life. Good practice in working with children is in the main body of the document; good practice working with vulnerable adults is the final appendix. This sends the wrong – and no doubt unintended message – about the significance of safeguarding vulnerable adults, and while practice on the grounds indicates no difference in the weight given to each group, it may be worth revising the guidelines.
- The inclusion of Kent County Council's safeguarding policies, at the Council's request, lengthens the policy to no purpose and adds irrelevant detail. The Cathedral recognised this at the time, but reasonably focused on the need to maintain positive links with its statutory partners.
- The section on Authorised Listeners suggests there are only two – the CSA and the now departed Canon Pastor – which does not tally with the list of Listeners supplied to the auditors.
- The policy does include a flow chart about reporting concerns, which is broad

and open: contact a senior member of staff and/or the Head of HR, who will refer to the CSA. Given the uncertainty about reporting lines expressed earlier, the Cathedral could consider whether the guidelines' broadness on this point leads to helpful flexibility or problematic confusion.

4.1.1 Information sharing protocols

The Cathedral has information sharing protocols with the Diocese, social services (child and adult services) and Kent Police.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Are the reporting lines in the guidelines clear enough to effectively guide people in their practice?

4.2 CATHEDRAL SAFEGUARDING ADVISOR, AND THEIR SUPERVISION & MANAGEMENT

Description

The CSA's agreement with the cathedral lists her key responsibilities:

- Produce and present an annual written report to the Chapter, summarising the previous year's work and outlining future safeguarding priorities and risks
- Advise the Safeguarding Management Group and Chapter on the safeguarding implications for its staff, volunteers and visitors
- Advise on up-to-date, robust and appropriate policies and procedures.
- Audit files and collate case reports as requested and appropriate
- Take forward safeguarding issues to the appropriate authorities as agreed and act as expert advisor and liaison between the authorities and the Cathedral
- Liaise with Church House on matters of national safeguarding
- Assist in the delivery of annual safeguarding and ad hoc training as needed

The CSA delivers relatively little of the safeguarding training; otherwise, this list fairly seems to represent her work with the Cathedral.

The CSA is a qualified social worker with extensive experience, who additionally practices as a child psychotherapist, and holds a forensic psychology and law qualification. She has worked for the Diocese of Canterbury as Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser (DSA) since 2002, and started working for the Cathedral in 2016, initially as cover for her predecessor as CSA, who was unwell. With him, in 2007, she did a safeguarding review of Canterbury Cathedral, and recommended many of the systems it now has in place. When her predecessor decided he could not continue, the CSA combined the DSA and CSA roles. She is shortly to relinquish the DSA job.

Canterbury Cathedral employs the CSA on a consultancy basis, to provide safeguarding advice as and when necessary. In practice, she works for the

Cathedral for about 1.5–2 days per week.

The CSA receives supervision from her predecessor as CSA (who was also once her colleague as DSA), so he knows her, and her work, extremely well. A contract sets out the supervision expectations: face-to-face meetings are held quarterly, with the possibility of ad hoc discussion when necessary.

There are no apparent conflicts of interest for the CSA. Her work for the Diocese, shortly to end anyway, ought not to create a tension.

Analysis

The CSA has appropriate and fitting qualifications and experience, a deep understanding of safeguarding, the Church of England, and the local area, and performs her role to a high quality. Her roles match what the auditors would expect to see.

Against this positive evaluation, the auditors note the extent to which different aspects were not yet embedded organisationally and remained a matter of chance related to the individuals currently involved. Key issues include:

Independent safeguarding voice and employment status

The CSA's status as an independent consultant is valued by the Cathedral; the Dean described the CSA as being an "outside, oblique, objective voice", unconstrained by internal Cathedral hierarchies, and thus able freely to give advice or challenge. The auditors recognise the merits of the argument, but are concerned that independent consultants, because they lack employment rights, might actually be easier to dismiss should they clash at all with senior Cathedral staff.

The auditors categorically do not think the current leaders in the Cathedral are of a mind to dismiss someone simply because they dislike their advice, and the Dean made it clear that it would require all of Chapter to agree to any such decision. But safe systems are stronger than relying on the good instincts of current incumbents, raising questions about the systemic strength of current arrangements.

Line management

The CSA reports to the Head of HR, but he is not her line manager in the full sense of supporting and developing her professional standards. Strengthening the relationship, such as through annual appraisals (including input from the CSA's supervisor) would increase accountability. The auditors are confident the CSA does a good job, but at the moment there are no substantive mechanisms to demonstrate and monitor that.

Formalising line management could usefully extend to having oversight of supervision arrangements. The auditors posited that the closeness of the CSA to her supervisor might mean he was not in a position to provide adequately robust challenge, but the CSA felt the positives of how well he understands her task and its context outweighs any potential risks. There is no external monitoring or scrutiny however of how this balance is working. That the supervisor takes notes which are

shared with the Head of HR, would seem to indicate a degree of integration of supervisory and line management functions to build on.

The CSA also has a strong working relationship and regular meetings with the Receiver General.

Flexibility of capacity

The CSA is generous in her flexibility, and currently has adequate capacity to be able to increase her time worked when it is needed. This is no guarantee, however, that the CSA will be able to provide the necessary capacity, and this increases the chances of the Cathedral being left without the resource required. This should be kept under review.

Lack of visibility

The auditors feel the question of employment links to the earlier discussion about reporting lines. The CSA does not appear on the organisational chart of the Cathedral, despite her being, in the Dean's words, a "seriously important officer" there (although the auditors note she is listed under senior positions on the website). Because the CSA often works from home, she is not always a visible presence in the precincts. And while her name and number are on cards that every member of staff and volunteer carries with them, it is natural that people will report issues to people they know, and see on daily basis. This creates a slight risk that matters that ought to be reported to the CSA will not be.

The auditors do not suggest the CSA becomes a full-time worker, always on site. But the Cathedral should consider other ways in which her visibility can be promoted. The arrival of the new Canon Missioner seems to be a good opportunity for a joint programme of introduction to the various Cathedral departments, and a chance to clarify reporting lines.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Can the benefits of the current employment arrangements for the CSA be retained while reducing the risks of her not having the employment rights that would go with being employed by the Cathedral?
- What mechanisms could best allow the quality of the CSA's work to be appraised and monitored – e.g. would annual appraisals of the CSA be beneficial?
- What steps will best promote the visibility of the CSA – e.g. through a story in *Chapter News*; photographs on the website; a joint meet-and-greet programme with the new Canon Missioner?
- Is there any better arrangement to secure additional safeguarding resource on a flexible basis?

4.3 RECORDING SYSTEMS AND IT SOLUTIONS

Having effective, safe and useable IT systems supports good recording and makes sure that information is secure, but accessible to those people with a legitimate need to see it. The auditors found that the Cathedral has adequate IT systems, and is developing better ones.

4.3.1 An overall recording and storage system

At the moment, older case paperwork is kept on a computer drive. The Safebase care management system used by the Diocese of Canterbury, is being used for newer cases in the Cathedral, and all old cases have now been transferred. One auditor saw this in use during the diocesan audit, and judged it to be effective and user-friendly.

4.3.2 Secure storage

The CSA works from home a good deal. At home, she has no paper files; these are kept securely in the HR office in the cathedral precincts. She has secure access to Safebase at home.

5 FINDINGS – LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY

5.1 QUALITY ASSURANCE

A safe organisation needs constant feedback loops about what is going well and where there are difficulties in relation to safeguarding, and this should drive ongoing cycles of learning and improvement. Robust quality assurance enables an organisation to understand its strengths and weaknesses. Potential sources of data are numerous, including independent scrutiny. Quality assurance needs to be strategic and systematic to support accountability and shed light on how well things are working and where there are gaps or concerns.

Description

The auditors identified a number of different quality assurance activities that had been initiated by the Cathedral:

- Canterbury Cathedral first commissioned an independent review of its safeguarding arrangements in 2007, and did so again in 2014
- A benchmarking exercise was commissioned, in response to a complaint and led by another cathedral, into how other leading cathedrals manage issues of workload for choristers, and changes to their schedule have been made as a result.
- Some staff, such as the Organist & Master of Choristers, and the Schools Officer, spoke of opportunities to benchmark their work against that of colleagues regionally and nationally.
- A satisfaction questionnaire of choristers and their parents was conducted, also as part of the response to a complaint concerning choristers' welfare.

Analysis

The long-standing commitment to understanding strengths and weaknesses in safeguarding practice in Canterbury is evident in the different activities described above. It is a strength that this has included independent scrutiny and willingness to look outwards and use benchmarking with other cathedrals.

The value can be strengthened by developing more of a strategic approach to these activities by creating a plan of the range of quality assurance activity, drawing on a wide range of sources of data, and a framework for capturing and collating the results. This seems to be lacking in Canterbury at the moment. Without this, the risk is that quality assurance activity is commissioned more reactively, in response to complaints or issues having been raised, rather than proactively as a means of identifying issues as early as possible. Such a framework would also enable the tracking of what was done in response to quality assurance data, and ascertaining whether it made any difference.

The CSA is contracted to provide an annual report to Chapter, but although her agreement with the Cathedral states that these are to be written reports, they have

by custom and practice been delivered orally. This does make it harder to track progress and changes over time. Similarly, the *Roles and Responsibilities* guidance requires the Dean to provide annual safeguarding reports to the diocesan Bishop. It is not clear that this is happening.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Where does responsibility for devising a quality assurance framework lie? Are there any good reasons not to develop one? Would it fit as part of an overall strategic plan for safeguarding?
- Is there adequate clarity about the level of formality and accountability about all reporting requirements – e.g. should the annual CSA safeguarding reports to Chapter be written?

5.2 COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE SAFEGUARDING SERVICE

A good complaints policy enables people to raise concerns, and to have timely and appropriate consideration of any problems. A strong policy is clear about who complaints should be made to, and how they can be escalated if necessary. Positive features include an independent element, and clarity that raising a safeguarding concern, and making a complaint about a safeguarding service, are two distinct things. Canterbury Cathedral's complaints process has merits, but can be improved in regard to some of these points.

Description

The policy was updated in early 2018, and is a general one for the Cathedral, not limited to safeguarding,

Analysis

The complaints process has strengths. There is clarity about the different stages; flexibility about how complaints can be submitted; and clear timescales. It is clear that a complaint about the safeguarding service is distinct from raising a safeguarding alert, and directs people to the CSA if they do have a safeguarding concern. The process is easily found on the Cathedral website.

The process lacks any independent element and therefore any external scrutiny. This becomes critical when complaints are made about people at or near the top of the Cathedral hierarchy, meaning that those charged with handling them will very likely know too many details of the case, or be too close to the people involved, for any degree of meaningful objectivity to be applied. In the context of increasing awareness of past cover-ups of abuse across different areas of the Church of England, the existence of actual and perceived independence when complaints are made is vital.

In practice, the auditors saw evidence of changes being made in response to complaints, even where matters were not resolved to the complainants' satisfaction. The institution appears to genuinely strive to engage with people who bring up safeguarding and welfare problems.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the complaints process, especially for senior staff, be strengthened?

5.3 WHISTLEBLOWING

There is an appropriate and concise whistleblowing policy. It explicitly covers volunteers and contractors, which is important in a setting like the cathedral which has so many.

It could be improved in two respects; it states that people should approach their line manager, a senior manager, or the Receiver General “in the first instance”, without any indication of what would happen subsequently; and it should include details of Protect (formerly Public Concern at Work), the whistleblowing charity.

The auditors did not see evidence of its practical application.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the policy clarify any lines of escalation for whistleblowers?

5.4 CATHEDRAL SAFEGUARDING ADVISORY PANEL

Based on the national guidance in *Roles and Responsibilities* for Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panels, the panel should have a key role in bringing independence and safeguarding expertise to an oversight, scrutiny and challenge role, including contributing to a strategic plan. No specifics are provided in relation to cathedrals, with the apparent assumption being that cathedrals are part of diocesan structures. This may be unhelpful where a cathedral, as in Canterbury, has its own panel, rather sitting on the diocesan equivalent.

Description

Canterbury Cathedral has a Safeguarding Management Group (CSMG), which was formed in c.2003. It is remodeling itself as a Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel (CSAP), in keeping with national guidance, and to remove any implication that they are involved in case work. Quoting its terms of reference, its primary role is “to provide a source of independent advice and expertise on sound safeguarding policies, procedures and practices to the Chapter and other senior clergy and officials”. It meets quarterly.

As well as the Chair, membership consists of the CSA, the Receiver General, the (new) Canon Missioner, the Security and Fire Manager, the Schools Officer, the Head of HR, the HR Project Manager, the chair of the Diocesan SAP, and a Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) from Kent County Council.

CSAP is chaired by a retired teacher, who has been a lay member of Chapter since 2003 and who took over as chair of the then CSMG shortly afterwards.

The CSAP has an executive sub-group, the Risk Assessment Group (RAG). RAG

membership includes all of the internal CSAP members. As the Management Group becomes more focused on scrutiny and advice, the RAG, possibly renamed, will become the Cathedral's operational safeguarding group.

Analysis

While not employed by the Cathedral, the chair of CSAP does not fulfil the requirement of independence from it in a meaningful way, as she has been central to its governance for so long, and has been (along with the Canon Pastor) the Dean's designated safeguarding lead for many years.

The membership covers key safeguarding aspects in the Cathedral, links with the Diocese, and external expertise, and appears therefore to be well-formulated. CSAP addresses issues as training, policy development, and safeguarding developments like introducing CCTV. From the evidence of the minutes, it is well-attended, appropriately focused on actions, and effective to an extent. It includes feedback reports on learning from safeguarding failings in the Church and wider society, which points to an improvement culture. There is some case discussion, but it appears to be correctly focused on oversight, rather than managing a case.

Chapter and CSAP have a significant overlap in membership: as well as the Chair, the Canon Pastor (and now Canon Missioner) provides a clerical link, and the Receiver General – the senior lay figure in the Cathedral – sits on both. CSAP is thus integrated into the Cathedral's prime decision-making body, and the Chair has regular access to the Dean.

The auditors are left with the impression that the CSAP works well as a decision-making forum, making service-wide operational safeguarding decisions rather than making recommendations. As CSAP moves explicitly to an advisory function, scrutinising and supporting the Cathedral's safeguarding leads, how it adheres to national guidance about providing an external and independent perspective becomes a pressing question, given this extensive overlap of personnel.

An important planned development for CSAP is to merge with its diocesan equivalent. Already, diocesan staff sit on CSAP, and Cathedral staff on the diocesan panel. Joining the panels together, while retaining separate RAGs, ought to strengthen the cooperation between the two bodies. It has proved difficult thus far to identify an independent chair of sufficient standing and experience, but it will be important also for the Cathedral to be clear as to the functioning of its own CSAP so it can join the Diocese with a well-developed sense of what it brings to and wants from, a merged body.

The auditors have not seen RAG minutes, but its terms of reference seem appropriate: looking at risk assessments, managing blemished DBS checks, and carrying out CSAP decisions.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What are the best functions for the CSAP, relative to the strategic responsibilities of the Cathedral's delegated safeguarding leads, and the

operational management of safeguarding?

- Who needs to be involved in discussions to review and clarify the functions of the CSAP?

5.5 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Safeguarding leadership falls in the first instance to the Dean, in that he leads on all aspects of life in the Cathedral. However, safeguarding leadership takes various forms – strategic, operational and theological/spiritual – with different people taking different roles. How these roles are understood, and how they fit together, can be determinative in how well-led the safeguarding function is.

From the evidence of cases and conversations, the auditors conclude that a cohesive, well-functioning team is developing around safeguarding leadership.

5.5.1 Theological leadership

Description

The remit for theological leadership in relation to safeguarding is with the Dean of Canterbury, and the residentiary canons on Chapter. It is for senior clergy to help congregations and others around the Cathedral to understand why safeguarding is a priority, and intrinsic to the beliefs of the Church of England. This aspect of the leadership role is the foundation for the culture of the Church and is critical in terms of making it a safer place for children and vulnerable adults.

The Dean, in post since 2001, sees his main safeguarding role as an ambassadorial one, of persuading others of its importance. This he does mainly in private conversation, using what he described as his “soft power” to influence fellow clergy, and other local civic leaders.

A concrete measure the Dean has led on, which has significance given the prestige of Canterbury Cathedral, is to make clear that disclosures of criminal activity against children and vulnerable adults within confession will be passed to statutory authorities.

Analysis

The clear commitment of the Dean to his leadership role is a strength. The stance on disclosures in confessions demonstrates courageous leadership which the auditors judge as extremely positive: an important statement about people’s welfare taking priority over all other considerations. Further use of his public voice would strengthen the theological leadership role in persuading all staff, volunteers and congregants of the theological centrality of safeguarding.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What public forums can the Dean and Chapter use to promote safeguarding awareness?

5.5.2 Strategic leadership

Description

Strategic leadership falls to the Dean and Chapter. The audit took place during a period in which the clerical part of Chapter was undergoing changes. The Canon Pastor has left, and an appointment has been made to a new Canon Missioner role, but the person was not in post at the time of the audit. The Canon Pastor was, alongside the chair of CSAP, the delegated safeguarding lead for the Cathedral. The Canon Treasurer has also left, and the Canon Librarian is a recent appointment. This leaves the Archdeacon of Canterbury, herself only in post for about two years, as the senior canon.

The Dean delegates strategic safeguarding leadership to two people: the Canon Pastor, and the chair of the CSAP. They speak to the safeguarding agenda item at each Chapter meeting. As safeguarding is a secular function within the Cathedral, the Receiver General plays an important role, strategically and operationally.

As part of the strategic management of safeguarding there is a section dedicated to it on the Cathedral's overall risk register, and it focuses on disclosures of recent and non-recent abuses, harm being caused to vulnerable people in the precincts, and the possibility of false accusations.

Analysis

In the absence of a Canon Pastor/Missioner at the time of their visit, the auditors were unable to get a clear sense of how the delegated lead clerical role operates. The chair of the CSAP addresses safeguarding at each Chapter meeting; from the minutes the auditors have seen, consideration of safeguarding at Chapter is regular, and at an appropriate oversight level.

As discussed above, there is an issue in that the role of the CSAP is to advise, scrutinise and challenge the safeguarding leadership of the Cathedral, and yet the chair is at the heart of the safeguarding leadership of the Cathedral.

There is not a strategic plan for safeguarding: a work plan for how the safeguarding service will be developed over time, and who will lead on what aspects of this. The safeguarding service is good, and that, the auditors judge, may have contributed to a sense that a formal plan is not needed. However, setting out the goals of the service, and tracking progress against them, would enhance accountability, help cohere the various strands of safeguarding work into a whole, and assist the Cathedral to identify any barriers to development. Canterbury Cathedral is such a large, diverse institution, and safeguarding work within it can take many forms. Clarifying what they are, and where the priorities lie, may prove useful.

Any work plan could incorporate training and quality assurance strands, and could be merged with that of the Diocese, if that feels suitable. This should be a role for the safeguarding leads, alongside the CSA. The plan would then provide a focus for the CSAP against which to monitor the Cathedral's development.

Relatively new to the Cathedral, the Receiver General is someone who takes safeguarding seriously, and who helps create therefore a cohesion between lay and clerical leadership. It is the Receiver General who has led on safeguarding improvements following a complaint about choir practices.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What strategic planning tool would best serve CSAP and the Cathedral?
- As Chapter welcomes new members, what is the plan for embedding safeguarding as core to its priorities and functioning?

5.5.3 Operational leadership and management

Description

The Cathedral's safeguarding guidelines identify the Head of HR as operational lead for safeguarding. He sits on CSAP, and provides management support to the CSA. The Receiver General, Chapter more broadly, and the Head of HR delegate safeguarding operationally to the CSA, who has the authority to make decisions such as when to refer matters to statutory authorities.

Analysis

The Head of HR had been in role for six weeks at the time of the audit, making it hard to form a judgement on how that role can develop most effectively, and the best way it can work with the strategic leadership for safeguarding.

The RAG is to become the forum in which senior clergy and lay staff, and operational safeguarding staff come together to make key safeguarding decisions, and the auditors see no reason why this would not be a successful forum.

To complete the circle, the CSA could usefully have more structured time with the Dean, to feed operational issues into the theological centre of the Cathedral.

An issue brought to light in complaints is that there is a limited concept of operational line management at a senior level, especially for people who are acknowledged as experts in their field, and who therefore have no-one who can effectively manage the actual quality of their work. This leaves the Cathedral vulnerable to the risks attendant to a lack of monitoring of people's judgements and decisions.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the revised RAG best fulfil its function as the executive safeguarding body, bringing theological, strategic and operational safeguarding roles together?

- How can operational and theological leadership formally feed into each other?
- Does more work need to be done to establish proper oversight at a senior level?

5.5.4 Culture

The most critical aspect of safeguarding relates to the culture within any organisation. In a Church of England context, that can mean, for example, the extent to which priority is placed on safeguarding individuals as opposed to the reputation of the Church, or the ability of all members of the Church to think the unthinkable about friends and colleagues. Any cathedral should strive for an open, learning culture where safeguarding is a shared responsibility, albeit supported by experts, and which encourages people to highlight any concerns about how things are working in order that they can be addressed.

Description

The Cathedral is both a global centre and a small and gated community, which manages hundreds of thousands of visitors, but has at its heart a small number of clergy and a regular congregation that is small in comparison to the numbers of visitors. Even the staff and volunteers who make it a large organisation do not detract from a sense of it being a distinct community, in which people typically know each other well.

Analysis

The auditors found that Canterbury Cathedral has a strong safeguarding culture. There is a clear sense that safeguarding is a collective endeavour, but that there are people who can be turned to for advice and support. As discussed, exactly who to turn to is unclear for some, but no one doubted that assistance would be available. Very little push back against the demands of safeguarding was reported, and from the Dean downwards, thought and reflection is given to how to make the Cathedral a safe place, while still a welcoming one.

In a closed environment, raising issues, seeking help, or giving critical feedback can be hard. The auditors did see indications that it can be difficult to speak out, and in one instance a tendency to manage internally matters which ought to have been handled with external help. But it is a learning culture, and the auditors believe that the Cathedral seeks to reflect and develop when things go awry.

Like any culture, that of the Cathedral is shaped in part from the top, and Chapter members and other senior figures should develop a supportive and open safeguarding culture further. Greater clarity about management functions, including a willingness to challenge, would work to enable this.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can senior people in the Cathedral further develop a culture of support and challenge?

6 CONCLUSIONS

This section provides the headline findings from the audit, drawing out positives and the areas for improvement. The detail behind these appraisals are in the Findings sections.

Safeguarding at Canterbury Cathedral is good, with many areas of strength. The auditors would highlight:

- well-established and effective safeguarding roles, advisory groups and training
- informed and engaged senior leaders within both the clerical and lay hierarchies
- strong systems and procedures for keeping people safe and well-monitored while at the Cathedral.

The key areas for the Cathedral to address relate to:

- developing clear oversight and scrutiny functions, as well as bringing independence into the complaints procedures
- formalising into a safe set-up the key elements of CSA role and its management which currently work well
- clarifying roles and processes to enable effective management of the interfaces between pastoral care and safeguarding work
- creating a clear value-base to underpin actions to balance the demands of elite performance with child welfare.

There are areas in which systems can be tightened and strengthened. However, the auditors believe that a good awareness of safeguarding, well-thought through processes and an open mind set will allow Canterbury Cathedral to continue developing an effective and reliable safeguarding culture.

APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS

DATA COLLECTION

Information provided to auditors

Prior to the audit, Canterbury Cathedral supplied the auditors with:

- a safeguarding self-audit summary
- an introduction to Canterbury Cathedral
- an organisational chart of Cathedral staff
- 2018 Cathedral safeguarding guidelines for the protection of children and vulnerable adults
- a notice of endorsement of Church of England safeguarding policies
- CVs of Authorised Listeners
- a 2007 report into Cathedral safeguarding arrangements, and of an external safeguarding review meeting in 2014
- minutes of:
 - Cathedral/St. Edmund's School liaison meetings
 - Chapter meetings, as they relate to safeguarding
 - Choir House safeguarding committee and sub-committee meetings
 - Choir House boys' meetings
 - Safeguarding Management Group meetings (to be renamed Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel)
- choir chaperone role description; guidelines; and observation forms
- Choir House parents' handbook
- responses from choristers and chorister parents to a 2017 wellbeing survey
- minutes of a meeting to review the survey responses
- complaints procedure
- whistleblowing procedure
- terms of reference for the Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel and its executive sub-group, the Risk Assessment Group
- job description and person specification for the Cathedral Safeguarding Adviser (CSA)
- working agreement between Canterbury Cathedral and the CSA
- supervision arrangements for the CSA
- details of Cathedral safeguarding training
- Safeguarding Memorandum of Understanding between the Diocese of Canterbury and Canterbury Cathedral.

Prior to the audit, feedback about working with the Cathedral was received from a Kent County Council Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) and an Adult Safeguarding Assurance Officer, also from Kent County Council.

During and subsequent to the audit, the Cathedral supplied:

- safeguarding section of the Cathedral's strategic risk register
- minutes of meetings between the CSA and choir chaperones
- list of lay chaplains
- volunteers' training schedule and training materials
- contract between St Edmund's School and chorister parents.

Participation of people in the Cathedral

During the audit, a Learning Together session was held at the start and end of the site visit, to discuss the Cathedral's safeguarding self-audit, and the auditors' initial impressions. The auditors were taken on a tour of relevant parts of the cathedral and precincts, and observed an evensong service.

Conversations were held with:

- Dean of Canterbury
- Receiver-General
- Cathedral Safeguarding Advisor
- Archdeacon of Canterbury
- Co-chair of the Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel, and lay member of Chapter
- Organist & Master of the Choristers
- Assistant Organist & Director of the Girls' Choir
- Head of Human Resources
- Sunday Club leader
- Visits Operations Manager
- Schools Officer
- Choir House Parent
- Vesturer
- Security & Fire Manager
- Bell Tower Captain (by phone)
- Two people who had made use of the safeguarding service (by phone).

Focus groups, of between 5 and 12 people, were held with:

- choristers
- other children – e.g. servers, Sunday Club users
- parents of choristers and other children involved in Cathedral life
- staff and volunteers
- members of the congregation.

6.1.1 The audit: what records / files were examined?

The auditors looked at six safeguarding case files; three HR files for evidence of safer recruitment; and two safeguarding contracts to allow offenders safely to worship in the Cathedral.