



social care  
institute for excellence

# **Gloucester Cathedral independent safeguarding audit (January 2019)**



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 March 2019  
by the Social Care Institute for Excellence and the Church of England

© Church of England

All rights reserved

Written by Hugh Constant and Lucy Erber

**Social Care Institute for Excellence**

Watson House  
54 Baker Street  
London W1U 7EX  
tel 020 7766 7400  
[www.scie.org.uk](http://www.scie.org.uk)



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	The audit programme.....	1
1.2	About SCIE.....	1
1.3	The audit process.....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Context of The Cathedral.....	3
2.2	Contextual features relevant to safeguarding.....	4
2.3	Description of the safeguarding structure (INCLUDING LINKS WITH THE DIOCESE) .....	4
2.4	Who was seen in this audit .....	5
<b>3</b>	<b>FINDINGS – PRACTICE.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Safe activities and working practices .....	6
3.2	Casework (including information sharing) .....	13
3.3	Clergy Disciplinary Measure .....	14
3.4	Training .....	14
3.5	Safer Recruitment.....	16
<b>4</b>	<b>FINDINGS – ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORTS.....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1	Policy, procedures and guidance .....	17
4.2	Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers and nominated safeguarding person.....	17
4.3	Recording AND IT systems .....	19
<b>5</b>	<b>FINDINGS – LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1	Quality assurance.....	21
5.2	Complaints about the safeguarding service .....	21
5.3	Whistleblowing .....	22
5.4	Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel .....	22
5.5	Leadership and management.....	23
<b>6</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS .....</b>	<b>28</b>
	DATA COLLECTION .....	28

# 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

### **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 built on work in the engineering and health sectors that has shown that improvement is more likely if remedies target the underlying causes of difficulties, and so use 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.

## 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

## 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.

## 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. Gloucester Cathedral's is here:

*Gloucester Cathedral, a spectacular, Grade 1 listed building, embodies 1,500 years of heritage, from its origins as a 7<sup>th</sup> century religious site to the great cathedral dominating the cityscape today. It is a place full of stories of people and events which have helped define our national identity and also demonstrate the changing face of local life and worship. [...]*

Today, Gloucester Cathedral plays many roles:

*The cathedral receives thousands of visitors who want to see the building, use it for personal reflection and prayer, attend events or learn about its heritage. We have over 250,000 walk-in visits from the UK and abroad every year, with a further 100,000 attending services and special events.*

*As an outstanding heritage asset, the cathedral delivers and hosts a varied arts and events programme, including the internationally acclaimed triennial Three Choirs Festival. We also host large community and civic events attracting thousands of local people, including university award ceremonies, Christmas market and the switch on of the city Christmas lights.*

*The cathedral's spirit of place ensures it is valued as a peaceful haven in the heart of the city. As a living place of worship, it supports a core congregation and many others who regularly attend its services where four separate choirs contribute to the cathedral's regular pattern of worship. As the mother church of Gloucester's Diocese and the seat of the Bishop, the cathedral also hosts diocesan services and events.*

*It is a place of training and learning for all ages. Over 6,000 primary school children come to the cathedral every year to participate in formal and informal learning activities, and a dedicated team of more than 450 volunteers is trained to support every element of cathedral life. Study days and workshops for adults are held regularly and our training programmes for young stonemasons and musicians are nationally recognised.*

*We work with a growing number of partners to support our commitment to outreach. The 'Breakfast Club' provides cooked breakfasts and pastoral care for the city's homeless every Thursday and Sunday, and we deliver a singing outreach programme in local schools, culminating in a major termly concert in the cathedral. We*

*also support many local charities throughout the county through our staff, volunteers and congregation.*

## **2.2 CONTEXTUAL FEATURES RELEVANT TO SAFEGUARDING**

Gloucester Cathedral, as the above description highlights, is a significant regional place of worship, event and education venue, and tourist attraction. As such, it needs to manage the safety and wellbeing of many people, including children and vulnerable adults. The strong focus on choral music, with four different choirs, alongside outreach work, concerts and festivals, means that a good deal of attention and effort needs to be paid to creating safe systems and cultures for young singers.

For the boys' choir, this involves close joint working with the King's School, which borders the cathedral precincts. King's School is a mixed independent day school with over 600 pupils, aged three to 18. Boy choristers receive a scholarship to attend the school. Girl choristers, and members of the youth choir and the junior choir, attend a number of local schools, including King's. This audit is of Gloucester Cathedral, and not King's School, although it does cover how the boundaries between the cathedral and the school work in safeguarding terms.

Gloucester Cathedral sits in a precinct in the heart of the city. Gloucester itself faces a range of socio-economic pressures, and is host to a significant number of homeless people and others experiencing deprivation. The cathedral plays an important role in addressing the needs of vulnerable adults locally, and this requires cathedral staff and volunteers to engage with the safeguarding challenges this entails.

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

The Dean and Chapter of Gloucester Cathedral are accountable for all aspects of cathedral life, including safeguarding. The newly appointed Archdeacon of Gloucester who is also a residentiary canon at the cathedral is to be the designated safeguarding lead on Chapter, but as she was due to start in post the week after the audit, there was no opportunity to speak to her.

The Gloucester Diocese has a Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel (DSAP), on which the cathedral is well-represented (see 5.4 for details). Safeguarding for the cathedral is overseen by the Diocese's Director of Resources & Safeguarding, and casework, training and other operational functions are shared between the two Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers (DSAs). All three diocesan staff work within the cathedral precincts, which helps joint working.

The Diocese and the cathedral have a service level agreement (SLA) for the provision of safeguarding support, which details contractually the support the cathedral receives from the Diocese. The SLA has been in place for a number of years now, reflecting the mature relationship between the two organisations, which, the auditors found, serves both well. The current SLA runs from 2018–2021, and is reviewed annually.

Because of the close working relationship between cathedral and diocese, the SCIE



audit of Gloucester Diocese in 2016, looked in part at cathedral safeguarding through the SLA, meeting senior cathedral clergy, and seeing some cathedral files.

There are other important overlaps in personnel between the cathedral and Diocese. Two residentiary canons and chapter members have significant diocesan roles, and the Director of Resources & Safeguarding was the interim Chapter Steward for the cathedral, prior to the current post holder starting. This was influential in developing close working ties.

The two current senior canons – the Canon Chancellor, who takes a lead on volunteers, visitors, education and pastoral care; and the Canon Precentor with a responsibility for the congregation and for music – both have important roles to play in relation to safeguarding.

The cathedral has a Cathedral Management Group, in which department heads meet to discuss all aspects of Cathedral operations, including safeguarding. The cathedral has recently appointed a Nominated Person for Safeguarding (NPS): a representative of the congregation who is to act as a bridge between congregants and cathedral leaders on safeguarding. We look at her role in more detail in 4.2.

## **2.4 WHO WAS SEEN IN THIS AUDIT**

The audit involved reviewing documentation, auditing case files, talking to people at the heart of safeguarding in the cathedral – such as the Dean, Chapter members, safeguarding staff, music leads, and people managing the floor of the cathedral – and discussing safeguarding with a number of focus groups. The site visit to the cathedral lasted 2.5 days. Further details are provided in the appendix.

### **Any limitations to audit**

Scheduling of rehearsal and Evensong meant that the auditors were not able to meet directly with choristers. Instead, members of the boys', girls' and youth choirs completed surveys about their experiences of singing in the cathedral.

The auditors did not, as planned, get to spend time in the Breakfast Club for local homeless people.

As the Tower Captain was unable to attend a focus group, the auditors did not have any engagement with the bell-ringing aspect of cathedral life.

## 3 FINDINGS – PRACTICE

### 3.1 SAFE ACTIVITIES AND WORKING PRACTICES

#### Precincts and buildings

The safe accommodation of worshippers, visitors, clergy, staff and volunteers – who when added together number well over half a million people each year – is a significant challenge. The conclusion of the auditors is that Gloucester Cathedral handles this well.

#### *Description*

Gloucester Cathedral sits within a cathedral close, in the heart of Gloucester, and in which many senior cathedral and diocesan clergy and personnel live. There is a gate keeper at the main entrance to the close, and CCTV coverage of it. CCTV footage of the cathedral and precincts is not monitored live, but used as a retrospective tool. The cathedral itself is opened at 7.30am by one of the vergers and closed, unless there is an evening function, at 6.30pm, after Evensong.

Much of the safe management of the cathedral falls to the team of vergers, led by the Dean's Verger, and consisting of three other full-time vergers and one part-time assistant verger. At the start of each day, one verger will be on duty alone, and often with few other people in the cathedral. The cathedral is more fully staffed between about 10.30am and 4.30pm, when the majority of volunteers, such as guides, are working. Two vergers are typically on duty for Evensong, and for larger services they are augmented by volunteer stewards.

Key staff carry radios, especially in more remote parts of the building such as the crypt. Other important mechanisms to ensure people's safety – such as a panic button linked straight to the police, and code words for emergency situations – are in place. The gatekeeper is connected to Gloucester's City Safe Scheme, whereby key institutions and organisations share alerts and information with each other.

From 1 April 2019, the cathedral will employ paid front-of-house staff. Their role will include welcoming visitors, and encouraging donations from them, and so they will play an important role on the cathedral floor, in terms of awareness about who is there, and what needs any visitor may have.

#### *Analysis*

The team of vergers play a central role in the safe operation of the cathedral, and auditors judged that they carry it out well. They are led by a very experienced Dean's Verger, and are well-connected to other parts of cathedral life. As examples, they are linked to the education staff, so know exactly which children are visiting when; they working closely with the King's School to manage their assemblies; and are alerted by café staff if they feel anyone using the café entrance to the cathedral may be in need of extra care or attention.

Each week, representatives from all departments involved in bringing people into the

cathedral have a diary meeting, in which the upcoming fortnight is planned in terms of who will be coming, and what support they need. This feels like a strong planning mechanism.

Both stewards and vergers demonstrated to the auditors that a safeguarding awareness comes as second nature to them; that every visitor to the cathedral is welcomed, but instinctively whoever is welcoming them is also asking themselves whether everything is alright with/for that person.

The auditors were satisfied that consideration of safe practices was also evident with volunteers, such as guides, flower arrangers and so on. People had a sense of which places in the cathedral are safe or less safe to be alone with other people.

The new front-of-house staff will play an important safeguarding function, and will need to work closely alongside the vergers in doing so. Thus far, only the manager of the team has been appointed, and he has a background supporting homeless people in the city, which feels pertinent. The auditors' view was that the cathedral may be thinly staffed at times, and the new roles should bolster this. The auditors share the concerns of some vergers and chorister parents that not having a person welcoming visitors on the main door prior to Evensong – who could also alert vergers or clergy to anyone with potential vulnerabilities – is a slight weak spot in the safe management of the cathedral, and the new staff could address this issue.

The auditors heard from a number of people that the signage in the cathedral, in English, does not deter those visitors who do not speak English from going into areas – such as the quire during rehearsal – from which they are prohibited. The auditors judged this to be a very minor safeguarding risk.

#### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- Can new front-of-house staff be scheduled to cover periods that are otherwise relatively low on staff/volunteer numbers?
- How can good working relationships between the vergers and front-of-house staff be developed from the outset?
- Are multi-lingual leaflets/signs a productive way of managing the safe passage of non-English speaking visitors?

## **Vulnerable adults**

### *Description*

Gloucester Cathedral welcomes a large number of vulnerable adults through its doors, either because it offers services to them, such as the Breakfast Club for homeless people; because vulnerable adults seek it out as a source of pastoral support, peace and quiet; or because staff and volunteers in the cathedral are themselves vulnerable. The city of Gloucester experiences a degree of deprivation which means the cathedral, especially in an era of cuts to public services, fulfils a significant welfare role.

The Breakfast Club for homeless people is the most obvious example of this. It has

run for 11 years, and operates on Thursdays and Sundays, specifically because these are the days when similar secular services are not operating.

More generally, visitors to the cathedral have a range of vulnerabilities, which may or may not be immediately apparent. They will typically be welcomed by a verger, a volunteer guide, a lay chaplain, or another member of the clergy. The volunteer managers do daily floor walks through the cathedral to help pick up on any issues confronting the volunteers.

Some cathedral volunteers and staff themselves have vulnerabilities. The cathedral's Project Pilgrim – a 10-year programme of work which includes an outreach strand – has brought in, for example, people on work placements who have learning disabilities. Some volunteers will develop dementia or other cognitive impairments. As part of Project Pilgrim, a number of cathedral staff and volunteers, including lay chaplains and Breakfast Club volunteers, have done mental health first aid training, and this is being offered more widely.

### *Analysis*

The auditors noted a clear understanding across staff and volunteers about how to support adults with vulnerabilities in the cathedral. The awareness that issues or concerns should always be reported was evident in conversations, and in policies and procedures. The bar for what ought to be reported, even if just to the volunteer managers, or another verger, is very low, which the auditors judged to be a strength of the culture. An example of this is that reports are made about potentially vulnerable tourists, even though people recognise they are very unlikely to be seen again. This speaks of an environment in which the sharing of concerns is a well-established norm.

Alongside this, the auditors sensed a culture of respect, welcome and support for vulnerable adults, such as people with learning disabilities. This appeared to hold true even where people may be disruptive to worship.

Again, the Breakfast Club exemplifies this. The safeguarding and welfare of the people using it is a central concern: all volunteers have safeguarding training and the volunteer leaders have Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) checks; absent users are noted, and enquiries made about them; and the safe arrangement of people is carefully planned. As a result, incidents of aggression are extremely rare.

A positive aspect of the safeguarding and welfare of the Breakfast Club users is that pastoral care is on hand from a member of the clergy; medical care is provided by a district or community nurse; and practical support is available from staff from one of the city's homeless charities. This suggests to the auditors that in the Breakfast Club as elsewhere, the cathedral manages the safeguarding of its vulnerable visitors cohesively and holistically.

## **Children**

### *Description*

Aside from being choristers, whose situation is addressed in the next section,

children come to Gloucester Cathedral in a number of capacities: as part of worshipping families; as people who go to Children's Church; on school and other educational visits; as visitors; or as servers.

Approximately 8,000 children a year come on organised school visits or educational tours, under the auspices of the cathedral's Education Team. Of these, c.6,000 have guided tours with the Education Team.

As well as paid staff, the Education Team has a pool of about 30 volunteers. Occasionally, team members go on outreach trips to local schools, where they abide by any safeguarding policies of their hosts.

King's School has its assemblies daily in the cathedral. During these, King's teachers staff the entrances to the building, and they and the vergers ensure no one else is admitted while the assemblies are in progress.

Each Sunday, the cathedral runs a Children's Church, in which children attending the main service are invited to join a child-focused session, either with or without their parents. Two volunteers (from a team of six, all of whom are DBS-checked) run each session. For larger services, extra volunteers are on duty.

Four of the cathedral's servers are children.

### *Analysis*

The auditors found the arrangements for education visits to be good, with some strong features:

- The explicit requirement that school staff retain primary responsibility for visiting children is made clear in the planning stages for visits. The DBS and insurance arrangements of the school are the school's responsibility, and are checked by the Education Team.
- As part of the planning for each visit, the Education Team ensures it has the contact details of the lead teacher from the visiting school, and all details about the trip are shared with the vergers.
- Most paid and voluntary members of the Education Team bring a professional safeguarding understanding from other roles to their work at the cathedral.
- Staff and volunteers are trained in safeguarding, and DBS-checked.

Consequently, the Education Team appears not to face significant safeguarding challenges. Where occasional issues do arise, such as children being photographed by tourists, or teachers becoming distracted and separated from their class, there are enough people, and the right protocols, in place to address them.

There is no formal chaperoning of child servers, but the only children currently in that role are with their parents outside of the services themselves, and in the short preparation time pre- and post-services, the Head Server, who is DBS-checked, always ensures they are accompanied.

Key staff in Children's Church have not had recent safeguarding training. This is

addressed further in the Training section.

### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- No questions to consider

## **Choirs**

### *Description*

Gloucester Cathedral plays host to a great deal of choral activity. There is a boys' choir, a girls' choir, a youth choir and a junior choir. Gloucester, along with Hereford and Worcester cathedrals, takes part in the annual Three Choirs Festival, with each cathedral taking it in turns to host. A number of other choirs and organisations sing at the cathedral.

Overseeing this activity, there is a Director of Music, an Assistant Director of Music, a Singing Development Leader, a Music Department Manager and an Organ Scholar.

The Canon Precentor has responsibility for managing safeguarding in the choirs, and for liaising with King's School and chorister parents to this effect.

The boy choristers attend King's School, a day school which is next door to the cathedral. Boy choristers rehearse seven times weekly, and perform six times. This represents a reduction in workload since the girls' choir was founded in 2016.

The boys are brought to the cathedral by their parents for an hour's rehearsal each weekday morning, and then they are taken to the King's School by cathedral music staff. Before Evensong, boys are encouraged to go to the lavatory in school, and then are brought over by cathedral music staff for rehearsal and performance, after which they are collected by their parents. On Saturdays, the boys rehearse in the afternoon, prior to Evensong, and on Sundays the boys rehearse and perform twice: at the Eucharist and at Evensong. The boys do not perform Evensong on Mondays or Thursdays.

Girl choristers attend a number of local schools – including King's – and rehearse three times a week, twice in the evenings and once on Saturday morning. The girls sing at Monday Evensong, as well as on other, less regular occasions. Parents are responsible for how the girls get to and from the cathedral. The choir is led by the Singing Development Leader.

She also runs the junior choir, established in 2014 for boys and girls, aged between 6 and 12 years. They rehearse once a week, and take part in occasional concerts and performances, as well as performing monthly as part of cathedral services.

The youth choir has been running since 1999, and caters for boy and girl singers aged between 12 and 18 years. The youth choir performs at Thursday Evensong, and rehearses on Mondays and Thursdays. It is led by the Assistant Director of Music.

Members of each of the choirs, and their families, are issued a handbook detailing matters such as where to drop off and collect children, how concerns can be raised, and what constitutes acceptable behaviour. The handbooks do not include contact details for the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers, and given the benefits of developing an environment in which any concerns, however small, can be raised, these could usefully be added.

### *Analysis*

All cathedral choirs raise a number of potential safeguarding issues. Young children need to be protected from any harm from the general public. Children working towards a highly prized goal in a competitive environment creates the potential for any choristers to be groomed by people in positions of trust within the choir context. Additionally, the demands of elite performance can be in tension with child welfare requirements and expectations. We deal with each in turn below.

A great deal of careful thought is given to the safe movement of choristers, from whichever choir. The auditors noted a very strong risk management culture; an example being a pre-tour planning trip to Canada by the music administrator to check over hotels and performance venues, and the provision of security staff within the hotels. The management and movement of children around the cathedral was devised alongside the Diocesan Director of Education, demonstrating good joint working between departments. When Gloucester hosts the Three Choirs Festival, parents of visiting choristers meet the Gloucester parents in advance.

Two disruptive incidents during Evensong that occurred in late 2018 were raised with the auditors. These were concerning for chorister parents, but the auditors were satisfied that the cathedral managed them well, and that it has clear procedures for handling disruptions during services, including panic alarms linked directly to the police. The auditors concluded, however, that having the door staffed prior to and during Evensong would further strengthen the safe management of choristers.

Another slight area of uncertainty the auditors picked up is whether choristers are allowed to be released by the music department to people other than their parents at the end of the day. More generally, there is a clear understanding between the cathedral and the King's School as to when the choristers become the responsibility of each organisation, and when and where that handover occurs. Clear and simple systems are in place for the sharing of issues, large or small, between the school and the cathedral.

The possibilities for grooming or inappropriate relationships, the auditors found, are considered carefully and appropriately minimised. Rigorous elements to this include:

- Relationships between adult and child choristers are kept formal, with the requirement that children address adults by surname
- No social media connections are allowed between any adult and child
- All adult choristers are DBS-checked
- No one-to-one music lessons are allowed
- If a page-turner is required in the organ loft, two children go there



The auditors found broadly positive relationships between the music department and chorister parents, with evidence that the department listens to the concerns of families when they are raised, and makes appropriate alterations. Indeed, parents said they are actively encouraged to complain and raise concerns, although the auditors noted that while the families of boy choristers have a termly meeting with the music department at which issues can be raised, the parents of other choristers meet them annually at most. As there is a safeguarding benefit in actively creating opportunities for problems to be aired, it may be worth addressing this imbalance.

There is a mentor for the girls' choir, but that aside, all chaperoning of the choirs is done by members of the music department, as opposed to people specifically in paid or voluntary chaperone roles. The auditors questioned whether not having people in post focused solely on the chaperoning and wellbeing of the choristers may be a risk, but were satisfied that there is a sufficiently holistic awareness of the welfare needs of the choristers among the music department, and that this is not an issue.

In relation to safeguarding in the context of the elite training that goes with becoming a chorister, the auditors saw no evidence that the welfare of children is being compromised by choir membership. There have been incidents in which concerns have been raised through the links with the school and parents, but the auditors found that the response to these has been positive and creative. The cathedral has involved recently music department staff in local schools so that current methods of pedagogy and behaviour management can be brought into the choirs.

The auditors did not meet the choristers, but the surveys they conducted as part of the audit suggest that while there is some regret at missing out on other school or social activities, and that they are sometimes tired, there is nothing that spills over into concerns for their welfare. Conversations with a number of choir parents back this up, and the increasingly shared workload between the different choirs is an obvious benefit in this regard. The auditors also saw evidence that the Director of Music will not accept a child into the choir if it appears that the child is unwilling, and is being pushed to join by family members.

An issue raised with the auditors that Christianity is drummed inappropriately into members of the junior choir did not appear to be a widely-shared concern.

#### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- Is there any reason not to include DSA contact details in the chorister handbooks?
- Does the recruitment of new front-of-house staff offer an opportunity to staff the main entrance to the cathedral for Evensong visitors?
- Can the cathedral clarify whether people other than parents can, with appropriate notice, pick choristers up?
- Can an equal opportunity for the parents from the three newer choirs be created to proactively raise issues with the music department?

#### **Bell ringing**

As mentioned, the auditors had no contact with anyone involved with the bell tower,



and so make no comment here.

## **3.2 CASEWORK (INCLUDING INFORMATION SHARING)**

When safeguarding concerns are raised, 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 a cathedral context, this includes helping to distinguish whether there are safeguarding elements to the situations of people receiving pastoral support. The auditors found the casework at Gloucester Cathedral to be strong.

### **Effectiveness of responses**

The auditors reviewed seven cases handled in the last three years, including adult and child safeguarding issues, and recent and non-recent allegations. A number of strong features were evident in the responses:

- Cases were well-led by the DSAs, in close cooperation with the cathedral
- Generally prompt responses
- Effective use of core groups (known locally as response groups) to manage responses to cases
- Appropriate and timely referrals to the Local Authority Designated Officers (LADOs) and effective joint working with them thereafter
- Holistic consideration of the needs of offenders and victims
- Creative and flexible responses to the issues raised by cases
- A willingness to bring in independent input where appropriate

No doubt enhanced by the DSAs' location within the cathedral precincts, there is a low bar for when matters of concern get raised with the DSAs, which means expert professional advice is sought promptly.

The auditors did see evidence of delays in the handling of one complex case.

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

There are no current safeguarding agreements, although one case involved good links with a parish in the diocese where there was an agreement in place. There was evidence also in one case of how the Dean appropriately used clerical authority to reinforce the requirement of a safeguarding agreement as a condition of worship.

### **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.

The recording by the DSAs was clear and well-structured, with evidence of careful case management which allows for issues to be tracked over time. Both DSAs

appear to record their work well, which helps them practise effectively when both work on the same cases.

### **Information sharing practice**

There is a cohesive and cooperative culture within the cathedral, and between the cathedral and diocesan safeguarding staff, which reassured the auditors that safeguarding issues are raised and shared appropriately. One person to whom the auditors spoke raised a concern that, the community being such a close one in the cathedral, the ability to raise a confidential concern may be compromised, as it would inevitably be found out who raised it. The person acknowledged this was to date a hypothetical concern, and the auditors saw no evidence that this was getting in the way of matters being broached.

### **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 targeted resources e.g. Authorised Listeners.**

Via its SLA with the diocese, the cathedral is able to offer victims/survivors of abuse access to an Authorised Listener service, with referrals to it made via the DSAs. The auditors did not see cases in which the service was used.

The safeguarding handbook given to all staff and volunteers in the cathedral lists a number of organisations to which people can be signposted, but this does not include organisations especially for survivors of abuse.

It is positive that local practice is to maintain regular contact with survivors, regardless of whether there is any news on their case, as safeguarding staff are conscious that, to survivors, the lengthy internal processes of the Church can look and feel like inaction.

#### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- Would it be helpful to include details of survivor organisations – e.g. MACSAS, NAPAC or the Survivors' Trust in the resources section of the Safeguarding Handbook?

### **3.3 CLERGY DISCIPLINARY MEASURE**

The auditors saw no cases involving the use of the Clergy Disciplinary Measure in a safeguarding context and did not hear of any such cases.

### **3.4 TRAINING**

Safeguarding training is an important mechanism for establishing safeguarding awareness and confidence throughout the cathedral. It requires good quality substance, based on up-to-date evidence, with relevant case studies, engaging and relevant to the audience. It also requires strategic planning to identify priority groups for training, details the training needs/requirements of people in different roles, and an implementation plan for training over time that tracks what training has been provided, who attended, and who still needs to attend or requires refresher sessions.

## *Description*

Gloucester Cathedral faces the challenge of maintaining the safeguarding training of dozens of staff and hundreds of volunteers, and it does this well.

Training is either done online, or led by a DSA, or both DSAs for more senior staff and music department staff. Face-to-face sessions are supported by relevant senior staff, so the Dean and Canon Precentor attend some sessions for volunteers; the Canon Precentor supports training for vergers; and volunteer managers are present for volunteer sessions. All volunteers with a role that involves public contact have face-to-face training.

The House of Bishops' national training framework is used, and supplemented by tailored sessions as relevant to the cathedral's needs. There have been awareness-raising sessions, for example, on dementia, autism, and mental ill-health.

Within the music department, staff receive additional C5 training from the DSAs, which refreshes and stretches existing safeguarding awareness, and lay clerks have a refresher session at the start of each academic year.

Training for new front-of-house staff is to be developed with the DSAs.

## *Analysis*

The training provision at Gloucester Cathedral is good. The DSAs' training is tailored with pertinent scenarios, and all the reports to the auditors were that the quality is very high. It would now appear that there is a positive cycle in which word-of-mouth feedback about the training encourages more people to take it up.

The importance of training is made clear to people. Letters to new volunteers, for example, make it clear that it is a requirement for any role, and the presence of people such as the Dean, Chapter Steward, Canon Chancellor, Canon Precentor and volunteer leaders gives the training significant status. This is a real strength.

Safeguarding forms part of everyone's induction training, and a clear plan for the training provision needed for volunteers is in place, so the cathedral knows what it has to resource in the year ahead.

Thought is evidently given to how to maximise the impact of training: mental health awareness sessions, for example, are run just before Advent, as the Christmas and New Year period is the busiest in terms of visitors to the cathedral with mental health difficulties. There is a thoroughness evident also, with sessions tailored to particular groups, such as bell ringers and Breakfast Club volunteers, and checks made that lay chaplains have had diocesan safeguarding training before they can start.

Within this careful planning, however, the auditors met a small number of people who have been in role for a long time without receiving safeguarding training, and these loopholes should be identified and closed wherever possible.

There was also some uncertainty among staff as to why some paid staff receive online training, when volunteers in similar roles are trained face-to-face.

**Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- How can the cathedral ensure all staff and volunteers are picked up in the training programme?
- What are the expectations around training for paid and voluntary staff, and are these clearly communicated to people?

### 3.5 SAFER RECRUITMENT

*Description*

Gloucester Cathedral contracts with the Diocese to provide human resources support, led by the Director of Resources & Safeguarding. This includes support with recruitment, interviewing, DBS checks and induction, and is clearly laid out as part of the SLA. The final arbiter on recruiting people with blemished DBS checks is the Director of Resources & Safeguarding.

*Analysis*

The auditors noted a very clear process for the safe recruitment of volunteers, including references, interview, and DBS checks where appropriate. All volunteer recruitment goes through the volunteer management team, so there is consistency, and this is supported by welcome checklist for all new starters, which covers safeguarding aspects of recruitment.

The auditors saw five HR files of paid staff, all from the music department. There were some good features to be seen, such as the files of senior staff being subject to an internal safe recruitment audit. While there was some inconsistency in practice relating to references, HR and safer recruitment were tightened in 2014 to address this.

There is uncertainty nationally about the need to do DBS checks for servers. Currently only the Head Server is DBS-checked.

**Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- Can references consistently address questions of safeguarding, where appropriate?

## 4 FINDINGS – ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORTS

### 4.1 POLICY, PROCEDURES AND GUIDANCE

#### *Description*

Gloucester Cathedral works under the House of Bishops' safeguarding policies, and supplements these with its own *Safeguarding Handbook for Staff and Volunteers*, most recently updated in July 2018. This has useful contact details and procedures for a range of cathedral activities, and templates for risk assessments that each department can use.

Both the general employee handbook and the general volunteer handbook cover safeguarding.

The cathedral also scrutinises the safeguarding protocols of choral societies and numerous other organisations that visit, and will not allow an organisation to host an activity in the cathedral unless these are judged to be suitably robust.

#### *Analysis*

The *Safeguarding Handbook* has a number of strengths:

- It is introduced by the Dean, thus giving it senior clout
- It is reviewed annually
- There are useful practical elements, such as templates, resources, and contact details
- It is localised and detailed enough so as not to clash with or duplicate national policy documents
- It acknowledges safeguarding risks honestly, and urges people to dare to ask challenging questions

Overall, the auditors noted a degree of thoroughness and rigour in the procedures, risk assessment templates, and partnership agreements with other organisations.

#### *Information sharing protocols*

Gloucester Cathedral has specific information sharing protocols with partner agencies. The cathedral should satisfy itself that it is compliant with new General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR).

### 4.2 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISERS AND NOMINATED SAFEGUARDING PERSON

#### *Description*

Safeguarding provision at Gloucester Cathedral is managed by the diocesan Director of Resources & Safeguarding, who has been in post as Head of HR since 2008, and who added safeguarding leadership to her role in 2012. She was acting Chapter

Steward for the cathedral prior to the current Chapter Steward starting, and this has helped the close partnership between the two organisations. The Director of Resources & Safeguarding oversaw the 2016 SCIE diocesan audit, and has brought a consistently professional approach to safeguarding across the cathedral and diocese. She is an honorary lay canon at the cathedral, reflecting her long service to the diocese and the cathedral.

Casework, training, and daily safeguarding operations for the cathedral are led by the two Diocesan Safeguarding Officers (DSAs), both of whom work three days a week, and who overlap each Wednesday.

The longer-serving DSA, in post since 2014, is a nurse by profession, with extensive safeguarding experience prior to coming into post, and has recently completed an MA in safeguarding in an international context. The more recent DSA started in 2017, is a qualified youth worker and has worked in bereavement services, and as a local authority early help team manager.

As part of the SLA, the cathedral purchases the equivalent of two days a month of DSAs' time. There is provision within the agreement to alter this, substantially if needed, should a cathedral matter require additional work.

The DSAs have ready access to the Dean of Gloucester whenever they need to discuss a case with him.

Both DSAs are managed by the Director of Resources and Safeguarding. The newer DSA receives professional supervision from a social worker locally. The longer-serving DSA, having left one supervisor for not giving her the challenge she needs, is considering using the same social worker as her colleague for her supervision and if this is not possible will select a new social worker for supervision.

There has been a new appointment of a Cathedral Nominated Person for Safeguarding (NPS), to act as an additional and complementary safeguarding contact point for the cathedral congregation and community on Sundays and during other congregation-led events; and a liaison with the DSAs, clergy and senior staff. The NPS is a chorister parent, with a son having moved from the boys' to the youth choir. She was in fact made NPS some years ago, but the role fell into abeyance. Her reappointment is on the understanding that she is included in communication loops about safeguarding, so can fulfil her role properly. The NPS has professional and school governance safeguarding experience.

### *Analysis*

The provision of safeguarding services at the cathedral is good. The DSAs do high-quality casework (see 3.2) and training (see 3.4), and are evidently accessible to, and are supportive of the cathedral. There are no issues about needing to delineate diocesan days from cathedral days; there is flexibility both formally in the SLA, and by virtue of the relationships between the diocese and the cathedral. The amount of time allocated to the cathedral is adequate to its needs.

Both DSAs, and the Director of Resources & Safeguarding, are well-known to the congregation and volunteers, and there is a clear sense that people understand they

can be approached with any concern.

The NSP role was too new at the time of the audit to make a comment on its effectiveness, although the auditors agree that it has the potential to perform a useful bridging function. It is positive that communication about the appointment came from the Dean, and was widely circulated. The cathedral will need to determine exactly what functions the role can best fulfil, how that will be communicated, and what liaison between the NSP and the DSAs will work. Practicalities such as the NSP having a dedicated mobile phone for the role will have to be considered.

The church's practice guidance, *Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies (2017)* stresses that safeguarding professionals should not be ordained, or have any conflicts of interest that would compromise their independence. In the light of this, the auditors explored whether the fact that the Director of Resources & Safeguarding is an honorary lay canon breaches this recommendation. It is an honorary title, with no governance function, and the restrictions in the practice guidance do not apply to the managers of safeguarding staff. In that regard, it is clear that the appointment does not breach the guidance. But the thrust of the guidance - that safeguarding professionals working for the church must be, and perceived to be, independent of church influence - means that the cathedral needs to be mindful that some survivors and others may perceive the lay canon role as meaning the safeguarding service is too closely linked to the cathedral hierarchy. The auditors also acknowledge survivors may view the appointment as a sign that safeguarding is taken seriously.

The same guidance recommends professional supervision of Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers takes place about every six weeks, which is more frequently than the DSAs use it.

#### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- How can the NSP role most effectively be established so it is an effective liaison between the cathedral community, the DSAs, and other senior people in the cathedral?
- Is the DSAs' professional supervision sufficiently frequent?

### **4.3 RECORDING AND IT SYSTEMS**

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 case files the auditors saw are well-ordered, with key information readily accessible, and useful features such as closure summaries. Files are locked, with access reserved for the DSAs, the Director of Resources & Safeguarding and appropriate administrators.

The diocese maintains its own electronic system of recording cases with reference numbers and secure password protection. The diocese maintains its own electronic system of recording cases with reference numbers and secure password protection

and all cathedral casework files sit within this.

**Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- No questions to consider



## 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.

The Diocese of Gloucester has a safeguarding quality assurance framework, which includes the monitoring of casework, training and support to survivors among other aspects of safeguarding work. One strand of the framework specifically relates to the cathedral, and involves staff analysing case feedback, chapter minutes and other sources of information to identify areas for improvement. This degree of structure around quality assurance is a positive aspect of Gloucester's work.

A culture of learning from experience, and from others, was evident in other parts of the audit, and is a strength. Examples include:

- the Breakfast Club carried out a lessons learned review after the one troubling incident experienced there in recent years
- reflection sessions after each school visit
- benchmarking of policies and procedures against other local visitor attractions, and active engagement with forums for people managing visitor sites
- genuine attention paid to how systems operate in the light of any case work
- a review of all past cases and Blue Files in 2016

#### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- No questions to consider

### 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.

Gloucester Cathedral's complaints policy is largely clear, and sets out timescales in which complainants can expect to have their issues addressed. There are elements which could be improved:

- Complaints about chapter decisions are to be raised with the Dean, as Chair of Chapter, which seems to point a complainant back to the very body they are

- complaining about.
- People with complaints about safeguarding are appropriately directed to the (independent) chair of the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel, but then to the Chapter Steward if they need to escalate a problem further. This runs counter to more normal practice whereby an independent element is brought after an issue has not been resolved internally.
- There is no apparent route to complain about the Chapter Steward, should that be necessary.
- Written complaints should be permitted by email; currently only postal addresses are provided.

**Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- Can the complaints procedure be strengthened, in particular so that complaints about safeguarding can be addressed internally where possible, and then go to an independent person if they need to be escalated?

### 5.3 WHISTLEBLOWING

The cathedral's employee handbook has a section on whistleblowing which is clear and concise, although could usefully give details of Protect (formerly Public Concern at Work), the charity that independently supports whistleblowers.

There is no equivalent section in the volunteers' handbook, which places them at a disadvantage, should a volunteer need to raise a concern.

**Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- Can a whistleblowing procedure for volunteers be set out?
- Can whistleblowing procedures for both employees and volunteers including contact details of Protect?

### 5.4 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISORY PANEL

Based on the national guidance in *Roles and Responsibilities* for Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panels (DSAPs), 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.

*Description*

The Diocese of Gloucester has a well-established DSAP, chaired in a voluntary capacity since May 2018 by a recently retired police officer with relevant safeguarding experience.

The terms of reference of the DSAP are clear that its role covers oversight and challenge, strategic planning, oversight of training provision, partnership working, and the development of policy and procedures. The DSAP has a clear strategic work plan that incorporates a cathedral strand of work.

Four staff represent the cathedral on the DSAP: the diocesan Director of Mission and Ministry, who is a member of Chapter; the Chair of the Cathedral Council, also a Chapter member; the Visitor Experience Manager; and, when appointed, the Archdeacon of Gloucester, who is also a residentiary canon at the cathedral. In addition, the two DSAs and the Director of Resources and Safeguarding attend as officers, with a remit that covers the cathedral as well as the diocese.

At an operational level the cathedral is planning to hold four meetings a year for heads of Departments with safeguarding as a standing item on every agenda. These meetings will be chaired by the Chapter Steward.

### *Analysis*

The auditors' view is that the DSAP seems to function well, with a good understanding of its purpose, and a clear work plan. The cathedral is strongly represented, and this is emblematic of the positive working relationship with the diocese. Also on the group are a number of senior people from statutory safeguarding services, which is positive.

The chair of the DSAP has regularly scheduled meetings with the Bishop of Gloucester, but not the Dean of Gloucester, and this risks at least the perception that the diocesan relationship is prioritised over the cathedral one. Regular meetings would also be beneficial given how little independent scrutiny there is within traditional cathedral structures of the Dean and Chapter.

The DSAP chair is organising governance training for the panel, so it better understands its scrutiny and challenge function, which is a positive step to take.

#### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- Can the DSAP chair have regular meeting with the Dean of Gloucester?

## **5.5 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

Safeguarding leadership takes various forms – strategic, operational and theological – 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.

### **Theological leadership**

#### *Description*

The Dean of Gloucester plays a dual leadership role, being both the senior figure in the cathedral, and nationally the lead dean for safeguarding.

He is the first lead dean for safeguarding, and recognises as a challenge that the Church of England organisationally thinks in diocesan terms, and so safeguarding processes were not initially designed with cathedrals in the forefront of people's minds. Nonetheless, he believes cathedrals have by and large caught up with dioceses, and prioritise safeguarding appropriately.

The Dean describes himself as being “ultimately responsible” for safeguarding, and for demonstrating theological leadership on it by speaking openly about it, and by ensuring it is part of everyday life in the cathedral, backed by the proper resources and processes.

The named safeguarding lead in chapter will be the new Archdeacon of Gloucester. The auditors did not meet her, but clearly it will be a significant safeguarding role. Given the existing strong safeguarding leadership, it will be important to define what role the chapter safeguarding lead fulfils.

### *Analysis*

The auditors found the Dean to demonstrate strong safeguarding leadership. Within an organisational structure in which there is little independent scrutiny of decisions made by Dean and Chapter, the Dean has actively sought greater challenge and transparency. He has committed Gloucester Cathedral to report all serious safeguarding incidents to the Charity Commission, which is now a requirement for dioceses, but not cathedrals. He has also introduced a requirement on himself to report annually to the Bishop on safeguarding, as he holds her license.

The Dean is engaged with and supportive of safeguarding work. He meets the DSAs whenever necessary, and has regular sessions, for example, with Children’s Church and Breakfast Club leaders. Congregants and volunteers were left in no doubt that he prioritises safeguarding, and speaks about it often.

The auditors have also seen evidence that residentiary canons in the cathedral are appropriately involved in casework, such as sitting on response groups and acting as pastoral supports to people involved in safeguarding cases.

#### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- What will be the focus of the new chapter safeguarding lead?

### **Strategic leadership**

#### *Description*

Strategic leadership for safeguarding rests with the Dean and Chapter. Safeguarding is a standing item on Chapter minutes, with monthly reports from the Director of Resources & Safeguarding, who attends in person three or four times a year. In addition both the Dean, and the Director of Resources & Safeguarding are members of the Bishop’s Senior Staff Team.

Chapter has one lay member who until recently was a local authority social services director, and one who is a recently retired local authority chief executive with long experience of safeguarding issues.

Given the proposed disbanding of Cathedral Councils, the Chapter at Gloucester is planning to introduce a wider stakeholder group to provide scrutiny of its work.

The Chapter Steward is the person with “executive responsibility” for safeguarding,

and has been in post since 2015. She illustrates, and understands, the blurring of strategic and operational leadership with a cathedral, in that she is a member of Chapter, and helps set the strategic direction for the cathedral, as well as being responsible for all operational functions.

As seen in 5.4, the cathedral is fully engaged with the DSAP, which sets the strategic direction for safeguarding, and works to an annual activity plan.

### *Analysis*

It is a strength that Chapter has genuine professional safeguarding experience within it, which reflects a deliberate policy to get senior people from a range of settings to bolster Chapter. Chapter is planning a skills and experience audit of its members to maintain a diverse and pertinent range of perspectives.

The wider stakeholder group strikes the auditors as a further positive example of a willingness to be open and transparent.

The Chapter Steward demonstrates the same inclusive and approachable management style as the senior clergy, which helps generate a sense of cohesion around the cathedral.

Another notable strength in setting a strategic path for safeguarding is the close cooperation between cathedral and diocese, with senior figures working together effectively.

### **Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- How can the proposed stakeholder group best support Chapter in its safeguarding work and make arrangements to consult survivor groups as appropriate?

## **Operational leadership and management**

### *Description*

Operational safeguarding leadership is shared between the Chapter Steward, in that she is responsible for the operational functioning of the cathedral, and the Director of Resources & Safeguarding, in that she manages the safeguarding professionals.

Alongside them, the Canon Precentor – in terms of support to the congregation and to the music department; and the Canon Chancellor – in ensuring the wellbeing of visitors, combine elements of theological, strategic and operational safeguarding leadership.

The safeguarding roundtable meetings provide a forum for operational decision-making at a departmental level.

### *Analysis*

Throughout all aspects of safeguarding leadership, there is a cohesion – between lay

and ordained staff, and between diocese and cathedral – which serves people well.

A general ethos of openness among leaders and safeguarding professionals makes it easier for staff and volunteers to raise concerns.

There is clarity within the cathedral that operational decisions on whether to refer concerns to statutory authorities rests with the DSAs.

**Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- No questions to consider

**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.

The crimes of Peter Ball, former Bishop of Gloucester, ended any sense in the community that safeguarding is not something the Church needs to worry about, but these now feel in the past, with what remains being people's genuine desire develop the most robust safeguarding culture they can. Appropriate policies and procedures have been in place for many years, and are constantly reviewed and improved.

A culture of safeguarding seems thoroughly embedded; something that is thought about and planned for as second nature to staff and volunteers. The auditors heard of there being some minimal resistance to the safeguarding agenda, but saw no evidence of it themselves, and judged that there is in place the training, the policies, the communication and the leadership to keep chipping away at whatever scepticism may remain.

A small pocket guide about safeguarding children and vulnerable adults was cited repeatedly to the auditors as being helpful for staff and volunteers, and it contains a lot of concise, useful information.

**Questions for Gloucester Cathedral to consider:**

- No questions to consider

## 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.

Gloucester Cathedral has strong safeguarding leadership, allied to that from the diocese. There is a conscious effort made to seek external input and oversight for safeguarding decisions. Operationally, the DSAs are well-managed, and carry out training and casework to a high level.

Strategic plans, a quality assurance framework, and strong policies and procedures buttress the work of the cathedral, and guide staff, volunteers and visitors in what is expected of them.

A culture where people can learn and ask about safeguarding, and escalate concerns, has been developed. When issues do arise, they are dealt with promptly and creatively.

A slight tightening of processes around training, and improvements to complaints and whistleblowing procedures, would further strengthen the cathedral's work.

Two new people – the Nominated Safeguarding Person, and the Chapter Safeguarding Lead, will need to be supported appropriately so they can develop their roles within a well-functioning system.

## **APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS**

### **DATA COLLECTION**

#### **Information provided to auditors**

In advance of the audit, staff at Gloucester Cathedral sent through:

- a background to Gloucester Cathedral
- biographies of Chapter members
- a governance and staffing structure
- Safeguarding Handbook
- service level agreement with the Diocese of Gloucester, and recent reviews of it
- Safeguarding Activity Plan for 2018
- Complaints Policy
- Staff Handbook (incorporating a whistleblowing policy)
- training records
- Safeguarding reports to Chapter
- Chapter minutes from four recent meetings
- personal overviews of safeguarding from key clergy and staff in the cathedral
- cathedral risk register
- volunteering policy
- Volunteering Handbook
- volunteer application pack
- samples of volunteering role descriptions and risk assessments
- recruitment processes
- volunteer training details, including induction training
- safeguarding, safety and security information sheets for volunteers
- Education Centre volunteer training and recruitment details, and risk register
- Project Pilgrim risk assessments
- Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel: terms of reference, membership, strategic plan, and recent minutes
- diocesan safeguarding quality assurance framework
- assorted safeguarding plans and documents from the recent past
- overviews, schedules and safeguarding specifics of all cathedral choirs
- descriptions of arrangements with King's School and with chorister parents
- assorted choir-related risk assessments
- behavioural policies relating to the choirs
- policies and procedures of visiting/non-cathedral choirs

#### **Participation of members of the diocese**

The auditors had conversations with:



- Dean of Gloucester
- Chapter Steward
- Canon Chancellor
- Canon Precentor
- two canons – one ordained, one lay – from Chapter
- Director of Resources and Safeguarding
- both Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers
- two Education Centre leads
- Project Pilgrim Community Engagement Manager
- Director of Music
- Assistant Director of Music
- Singing Development Leader
- Dean's Verger
- other members of the verger team
- Breakfast Club leader
- Children's Church leader

Focus groups were held with:

- chorister parents
- volunteers
- congregants
- cathedral staff

The auditors also observed the choristers' preparation for evensong, evensong, and the arrangement for choristers afterwards.

The auditors saw survey responses about safeguarding from 28 members of the youth choir; 19 members of the girls' choir; and 16 members of the boys' choir.

### **The audit: what records / files were examined?**

The auditors looked at seven case files; and five recruitment files for evidence of safer recruitment.

### **Limitations of audit**

As mentioned, the auditors did not speak directly to choristers, users of the Breakfast Club, or bell ringers. Notwithstanding, the audit was well-organised and planned, and the auditors would like to thank Gloucester Cathedral for their efforts on this regard.