



social care
institute for excellence

Guildford Cathedral independent safeguarding audit (February 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 July 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



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	3
2.4	Who was seen in this audit?	4
3	FINDINGS – PRACTICE.....	5
3.1	Safe activities and working practices	5
3.2	Casework (including information sharing)	13
3.3	Clergy Disciplinary Measure	14
3.4	Training	14
3.5	Safer recruitment.....	16
4	FINDINGS – ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORTS.....	18
4.1	Policy, procedures and guidance	18
4.2	Diocesan safeguarding adviser/s and cathedral safeguarding officer	19
4.3	Recording and IT systems.....	21
5	FINDINGS – LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY	22
5.1	Quality assurance.....	22
5.2	Complaints about the safeguarding service	22
5.3	Whistleblowing	23
5.4	Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel	23
5.5	Leadership and management.....	24
6	Conclusions.....	28
7	APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS	29
	DATA COLLECTION.....	29

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 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.

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. Guildford Cathedral's is here, supplemented by information from its website:

Guildford Cathedral was consecrated in 1961, building having commenced in 1933 following the formation of Guildford Diocese in 1927. It is the most recent Anglican cathedral to have been constructed on a new site. Between 2016 and 2017 the Cathedral underwent a major refurbishment [and...] in 2018 the Chapter launched a new vision for Guildford Cathedral, stating the intention to make it a warm-hearted community, open to God, open to all.

2.2 CONTEXTUAL FEATURES RELEVANT TO SAFEGUARDING

Guildford Cathedral differs from many other cathedrals in ways which are relevant to safeguarding. It is relatively small as an organisation, with 29 paid staff, amounting to about 12 whole-time equivalent employees. It is also, as the above description illustrates, new in Church of England cathedral terms. It was built in the age of the car, and sits on top of a hill a little way out of the centre of the city, which affects the number of passing visitors it receives. It does not conform to the general sense of what typifies an English cathedral, which contributes to it attracting fewer tourist visitors than some cathedrals.

The Cathedral's relative isolation can mean that its location has, at times, attracted an element of anti-social behaviour.

Guildford Cathedral has two choirs: a boys' choir and a girls' choir. The girls are drawn from a number of local schools. The boy choristers all attend Lanesborough School in Guildford, or, if they are still in the choir in year 9, the Royal Grammar School, Guildford (RGS), for which Lanesborough is the preparatory school. Lanesborough, as the prep school for RGS, has no separate governing body. There is a sub-committee, however, on which the Cathedral's Canon Liturgist sits.

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

The Dean of Guildford, as the leader in all aspects of life at the Cathedral, is the senior safeguarding figure. Alongside her are:

- the Chapter Safeguarding Representative (CSR), the Sub-Dean of Guildford, whose remit includes oversight of safeguarding; liaison with the Diocese of Guildford and Lanesborough School about safeguarding; attending the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel (DSAP); and helping develop the safeguarding culture at the Cathedral
- the Cathedral Safeguarding Lead (CSL), the Chief Operating Officer, responsible for the management and funding of safeguarding; the policies,

procedures and administrative support that underpin it; and the proper monitoring of any safeguarding agreements in the Cathedral

- the Cathedral Safeguarding Officer (CSO), a voluntary role acting as the congregation's and community's point of contact, able to discuss safeguarding concerns with senior clergy and senior management. The auditors met the CSO, but she was stepping down from her role the day after the audit (see section 4.2 for more details)

The three people listed come together as the Cathedral Safeguarding Leadership Group (CSLG).

There are numerous links with the Diocese of Guildford which are pertinent to safeguarding. The Dean is a member of Bishop's Staff Meeting which has responsibility for safeguarding in the Diocese of Guildford; safeguarding is a standing agenda item at the monthly meetings. The CSR attends DSAP, and – where appropriate – its casework sub-group. Professional casework in the Cathedral is done by the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser (DSA), and some of the Cathedral's training is delivered by the safeguarding training lead for the Diocese.

There is no formalised contract between the Cathedral and Diocese for the provision of safeguarding support, although House of Bishops' policies recommend that there is. There are however safeguarding liaison meetings between the Diocese and the Cathedral, three times a year.

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, some 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.

2.4.1 Any limitations to audit

Despite the challenges of being one of the first cathedrals to be audited, the site visit to Guildford Cathedral was well planned, with a good deal of effort and time expended in its preparation. The auditors did not see anyone from the bell tower, but that aside, there were no limitations to the audit process.

3 FINDINGS – PRACTICE

3.1 SAFE ACTIVITIES AND WORKING PRACTICES

3.1.1 Precincts and buildings

It is a challenging task to manage the safety and welfare of significant numbers of people in a large, historic building. The staff and volunteers at Guildford Cathedral do this well, the auditors judged, although there are areas in which procedures could be tightened.

Description

Guildford Cathedral is located at the top of a hill just outside the city of Guildford. It is a relatively isolated position, compared to older cathedrals typically in the centre of cities. There are few people in and around the Cathedral who come there in passing; most visitors are there with an intentional purpose. At times, the isolated location is an attraction for people wishing to drink, take drugs or do other activities away from the public eye.

The safe management of the building and precincts is largely the responsibility of the virger team: the Dean's Virger; the Canons' Virger; one other full-time resident virger; one part-time virger; and four volunteer virgers. The three full-time, resident virgers and the part-time virger have DBS checks and undergo safeguarding training. The volunteer virgers do not require DBS checks but do receive safeguarding training.

The virgers are typically the first people in the Cathedral in the morning, and the last at night, and are subject to lone working procedures accordingly. They carry a pager and a mobile phone. The virgers spoke of the sense of Christian welcome which they extend to all visitors: warm, but alert to any needs the visitor may have. The virgers staff Cathedral entrances prior to Evensong.

Other important people in the management of the building and its services include volunteer guides, stewards, and servers. Of these groups, only the servers are required to have a DBS check, but all are expected to attend safeguarding training.

On occasion, the Cathedral is hired out to external agencies for their own use, and at other times outside groups join the Cathedral for large services and concerts. There is a significant logistical challenge to be addressed during large events, as crypt space, reserved for choristers while they are in the Cathedral, cannot easily accommodate visiting choirs or orchestras. While the crypt is reserved for choristers, there is limited lavatory provision for anyone else.

Other aspects of safety around the building include some CCTV coverage of the grounds, focused mainly on the entrances to the Cathedral; emergency evacuation plans focused on eventualities such as a terrorist attack; and weekly diary management meetings for departmental heads, so that issues relating to the safe running of the Cathedral space can be addressed.

Analysis

The auditors noted a number of strengths in how the building and space around it is safely managed:

- The virgers, guides and stewards are experienced, and aware of the safeguarding challenges with which they may be presented. Issues are given careful thought, and discussed openly.
- The modernity of the Cathedral design brings with it fewer isolated areas on the Cathedral floor.
- There has been more focus recently on communicating to external organisations what the safeguarding expectations are upon them when they use the Cathedral. Procedures to bolster this understanding, such as risk assessments and clear booking forms, are now in place. Evidently, some organisations need further support to understand the priority given to safeguarding.
- The weekly diary planning meetings and monthly meetings of senior volunteers are useful forums for addressing issues about the safe management of visitors to the Cathedral.

Some technological issues were evident. CCTV coverage is only partial, and does not work effectively at night, and the virgers' phone and pagers are of limited use if they are in the crypt, due to poor reception.

The auditors heard many issues about the implications of the crypt being reserved for the sole use of choristers while they are in the building, but judged these to be less significant than the wellbeing of the choristers.

Managing large events is evidently challenging, with significant numbers of visiting choristers and other performers, but it is encouraging that lessons appear to be learned after each occasion, and improvements made accordingly. With ongoing reflection on previous gatherings, and planning for upcoming ones, there do not appear to be any fundamental reasons why large performances cannot be run safely in the future.

The management of the Cathedral is taking place in a context in which, for a number of demographic and socio-economic reasons, the Cathedral is struggling to attract volunteers in the numbers that it has in the past.

Questions for Guildford Cathedral to consider:

- How can Cathedral staff better communicate with external organisations hiring or using the Cathedral about what is required of them in safeguarding terms?
- What are the implications of the technological limitations, and can these be addressed in any way?
- How can the challenges of managing large events with multiple participants be managed while maintaining the welfare of choristers, other vulnerable performers, and vulnerable visitors?

3.1.2 Vulnerable adults

Description

The report has already touched on Guildford Cathedral's location, and the impact that has on people with vulnerabilities coming to it. While the location means relatively few people who have vulnerabilities, or who may create a vulnerability for others, are present, the isolation of the Cathedral leaves some people feeling anxious and exposed, because of a sense that one is far from help.

There are times, notably during the late afternoon, when there are few people around, which adds to some people's anxiety. There are fewer day chaplains on duty than used to be the case, sometimes only once a week, although they have never worked beyond 2pm. If someone comes and wants to speak to a member of the clergy, and no-one is around, then they are asked to come back to the next service. The virgers have access to money for people who appear in need to have a drink and a snack from the Cathedral café.

As well as occasional vulnerable adults coming to the Cathedral unannounced, there are other more structured ways in which the Cathedral engages with people with additional needs. Six pastoral assistants visit people in their own homes as part of the pastoral care provided to the congregation. These are all trained in safeguarding, and have DBS checks. The Cathedral runs Thursday Coffee Concerts, typically attracting 100–200 people, many from local care homes. And a number of the Cathedral's volunteers have cognitive impairments and other vulnerabilities.

Analysis

The auditors detected varying levels of confidence about how to support people with additional needs, and how to manage situations in which people may potentially pose a risk. This differing degree of confidence is understandable in a context where such situations arise infrequently.

Paid staff – clergy and virgers in particular – appear confident in their work, conscious of emergency protocols, and aware of how and where to best support people with vulnerabilities. Volunteers, perhaps unsurprisingly, expressed less confidence about how to be both welcoming to people, yet attuned to any risk that may be present, or how best to support vulnerable volunteers.

Alongside that, however, there appeared to be a good shared understanding that if people do have concerns, these should be reported to the clergy or to virgers.

The auditors noted a sense of anxiety about people with mental health problems, perhaps born of actual or possible incidents involving people with disturbed mental states. An aide memoire about working with people with mental health problems has been developed, which is a positive step. The tone and language of it – 'dealing with'; people, rather than 'supporting' them – could be improved to help foster a sense that people with mental health problems are more typically seeking help than posing a risk.

There was an evident lack of certainty about two specific issues. One relates to how

and whether communication about people who may present a risk is shared among clergy and staff; auditors heard differing views on how effectively any systems work. The second relates to what duties people have if they witness abuse or neglect of care home residents or other vulnerable people attending the Cathedral while in the care of external organisations. Procedures addressing both of these situations would help clarify how best to safeguard vulnerable adults and others in the Cathedral.

Another positive aspect in this area is evidence of a learning culture, in which Cathedral staff reflect on events involving vulnerable adults, and adjust working practices accordingly.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Is there training and support available about working with people with mental health problems? What local groups, including groups of people with mental health problems themselves, might be able to assist with this?
- In the light of differing opinions about whether details of people causing concern are shared, can the Cathedral draw up a protocol which improves communication channels and ensures that people are confident of being kept informed about situations in the building?
- Can a protocol for how to raise alerts about the abuse and neglect of vulnerable adults in the care of external organisations be developed?

3.1.3 Children

Description

Aside from being choristers (dealt with in the next section), children come to Guildford Cathedral as congregants, tourists, servers, people considering confirmation, users of Sunday School, and as visitors on school trips.

School visitors account for the majority of children's visits to the Cathedral, with c.1,500 attending each year. Visits typically take the form of tours, or workshops, with about 60 children on site at a time. School visits are managed by the Schools and Family Learning Department.

The head of the Schools and Family Learning Department is leaving. A new role has been created, Head of Families Engagement and Schools, and line management has been shifted from a senior member of clergy to the Chief Operating Officer to ensure consistency.

Sunday School provides for children whose parents attend Sunday morning worship; usually this is three to five children. They are supported by a Sunday School leader and an assistant. People working in Sunday School now all have DBS checks, although not all staff have yet undertaken safeguarding training.

Other formal contexts in which children are welcomed include confirmation classes; Cathedral Tots, a new monthly gathering for very young children and their parents; and fun days run during half-term, where craft and other activities are on offer. These fun days, because there are no booking systems, attract an unpredictable number of visitors, sometimes as many as 400.

Currently, there are no child servers at the Cathedral. Were there to be, they would be chaperoned by their parents.

Analysis

School visits are well run. Strengths include:

- In advance of any school visit, booking forms and risk assessments are taken from the school. A staffing ratio of one adult to eight students is insisted upon.
- Information shared with schools is clear about the limits of the Cathedral's responsibilities to the children, and that the school, rather than the Cathedral, is in charge of the students' safeguarding.
- All staff in the Schools and Family Learning Department are trained in safeguarding and have DBS checks.
- There is a clear procedure for reuniting lost children with their teachers (or with their parents in other contexts).

Careful thought is given to the proper guiding of child visitors, for example not showing them parts of the Cathedral that are out of general sight, and managing physical contact appropriately. This has been a difficult adjustment for some guides, but people have come to understand the change of safeguarding culture that requires these measures to be put in place.

It is positive that Sunday School leaders and volunteers are recruited for the purpose with DBS checks being conducted. The improvements to safer recruitment noted in section 3.5 apply to Sunday School roles too, so that routinely and reliably application forms are used and references sought, as well as DBS checks. The auditors noted one additional area for improvement in relation to Sunday School. We noted that it is possible (though not usual) to perform this role without having undertaken safeguarding training. Addressing this would close a gap that introduces the potential for risks.

Confirmation classes have been run by a married couple, in their home. It is poor safeguarding practice to have children supervised only by adults in a close relationship, as it compromises the independent scrutiny of each other that adult supervisors of children have to provide. To this end, the matter was reported to the CSR and DSA, who confirmed it was not good practice, but who felt that informing the parents was a sufficient safeguard. The auditors disagree: hosting children in couple's homes is an unhelpful blurring of boundaries. Meetings do still take place in people's homes, because the Cathedral has identified no practical alternative.

Some of the issues the auditors identified relate to senior figures in the cathedral. Where it is the leaders of an organisation whose work is seen as falling short of best practice standards, there is an evident risk that this sets a poor example to others.

A new employee working with children is close to a senior member of staff, which means the Cathedral needs to be alert to a potential dynamic in which people may be reluctant to raise concerns relating to their practice. The auditors note that there are avenues for reporting concerns – to the DSA or CSO for example – which should address this.

Cathedral staff recognise the potential risks of having fun days with entirely unpredictable numbers of attendees. The plans to introduce a booking system appear well judged.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What steps need to be taken to make sure that everyone volunteering/working in Sunday School is suitably trained?
- What steps need to be taken to ensure that wherever two adults need to be present for the safe support of children, those adults are not in a close relationship?
- Can it be assured that classes for children do not take place in people's homes?
- How can any issues arising from someone in a close relationship with a senior member of staff managing the provision of services to children be further minimised?

3.1.4 Choirs

Description

Guildford Cathedral runs two choirs: a boys' choir and a girls' choir, each singing alongside paid lay clerks.

The boys all attend Lanesborough School in Guildford, unless they are still in the choir in year 9, in which case they will attend the Royal Grammar School (RGS), the school for which Lanesborough is the preparatory school. Lanesborough is soon to change, and end at year 6, so the Cathedral will need to work more commonly with RGS. Boy choristers are supported with their school fees by the Cathedral.

Lanesborough is the designated choir school for the boy choristers. The governance of the school is independent of the Cathedral. There are weekly meetings between the Organist & the Master of the Choristers at the Cathedral (henceforward referred to as the Organist), and the Head of Lanesborough School, and termly meetings focused solely on safeguarding between the Head and the CSR. If any pastoral or safeguarding concerns are raised at the weekly meetings, these are shared with the CSR.

Girl choristers attend a number of local schools. The responsibility for getting to and from the Cathedral rests with them or their families. Boy choristers are dropped off by their parents at Lanesborough School (or make their own way there, if they have parental permission) for morning rehearsals led by Cathedral music staff on four mornings a week. As they rehearse with the boys on Lanesborough property, the Cathedral music staff are also trained in Lanesborough safeguarding protocols, and have DBS checks with Lanesborough as well as the Cathedral. After school, if they are singing at Evensong, the boys are driven to the Cathedral in a chaperoned minibus provided by the Cathedral.

The Cathedral operates a 10-minute rule, under which it only takes responsibility for

children from 10 minutes before, and 10 minutes after, any rehearsal or performance. Outside that timeframe, choristers are the responsibility of parents or school.

The staffing of the Music Department is led by the Organist, and includes the Sub-Organist; an organ scholar; a vocal consultant; an administrator; the lay clerks; and a number of volunteer chaperones, many of whom are chorister parents. The Cathedral recently appointed a paid lead chaperone, but the post-holder was leaving at the point of the audit, after a few weeks in the role. All Music Department staff are trained in safeguarding to varying extents, and all have a DBS check. The Canon Liturgist has responsibility for all Music Department staff, paid and voluntary, and all music activities.

Lay clerks sing Monday Evensong and one Sunday service without child choristers. The boys' choir sing at Tuesday and Thursday Evensongs, and one Sunday service. The girls rehearse twice weekly, and sing at Friday Evensong and at one Sunday service. There is no sung service on Wednesday evenings.

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.

The safe movement and chaperoning of children have been honed over a number of years, and generally work well, although the departure of the new lead chaperone is a temporary setback. With her resignation, music staff are having to chaperone on the minibus trips to the Cathedral. This increases the pressure on them, but the auditors note the commitment to making sure the children are chaperoned as per policy.

The quality of some chaperoning is limited; this reflects the ongoing challenge of recruiting a sufficiently wide pool of skilled volunteers. Evidently, chaperoning is an important role, and doing it on a voluntary basis places a good deal of pressure on people.

A potential weak point in the safe movement of the boy choristers is that some parents drop their children at Lanesborough and leave them before either school or music staff arrive. While this issue rests with the parents, Lanesborough and the Cathedral need to think how they can continue to communicate that this is an unacceptable risk.

Another occasional problem arises when a child falls ill during a service or performance. They are taken by a chaperone to the crypt, but this does mean that, against best practice, an adult is alone with a child in a secluded setting. There is also a slight inconsistency in practice in that children are chaperoned to the lavatory in the crypt if they are rehearsing in the quire, but not to their vocal coaching sessions, also in the crypt. The auditors acknowledge that the risks here are minimal.

On one occasion, child choristers were chivvied from their robing rooms by a lay clerk, without a warning knock on the door. The auditors found this was a source of slight discomfort for the choristers.

The management of Cathedral tours is impressive, the auditors concluded, with strengths including preliminary trips by Music Department staff to all tour locations, and a refusal to use host families because of insufficient safeguarding checks on them.

The auditors judged that there is awareness that the risks to choristers can be from staff, rather than just from the public, although the notes for chaperones in the Cathedral's safeguarding handbook (see section 4.1) could be strengthened in this regard. The maintenance of a purely professional relationship between the children and the lay clerks is also a safeguard.

It was evident to the auditors that musical performance does not come at the expense of child welfare. Choristers and their parents were as one in praising the manner in which the children are taught and supported. The auditors saw evidence of an impressive awareness and commitment to welfare issues, not least from the Organist herself.

There is a sensitivity to the pressures choristers may be under, and adjustments are made to schedules if there is a risk of overwork. Choristers are clear about who they can talk to if they have any worries, and are pleased that they are offered a choice of people. Similarly, parents have termly meetings with music staff, at which they are encouraged to raise concerns.

The meetings with Lanesborough School reflect an improving relationship with the school. The new expectations on visiting choirs to have safeguarding policies in place also further demonstrates a commitment on the Cathedral's part to work in partnership with other organisations.

Evidently, the choirs are a clear priority in the life of the Cathedral, and the safeguarding of them is a priority too, even where that is at the expense of competing demands. The auditors share the general view that the Organist and her team are diligent and effective in promoting the welfare of the choristers.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What preparatory work can be done to ensure a smooth working relationship with RGS Guildford once more boy choristers attend there?
- Can chaperoning be reliably done on a voluntary basis, or are the demands better suited to paid roles?
- How can the parents of boy choristers be supported to stop leaving their children unattended in the mornings?
- Would CCTV or similar in the crypt kitchen address the issue of chaperones being alone with poorly choristers?
- Is it proportionate to chaperone choristers to the vocal coaching sessions?
- Can it be made a clear expectation that lay clerks knock before entering children's robing rooms?

3.1.5 Bell ringing

The auditors did not meet anyone from the bell tower. However, we have seen paperwork detailing clear expectations that visiting ringers operate to House of Bishops safeguarding protocols, and that any safeguarding agreements to which visiting ringers may be subject are declared.

All the regular bell ringers are volunteers. Only the Tower Captain is required to have a DBS check, and any under-18 ringers must be accompanied by a parent or guardian.

The relationship between the Cathedral and the bell ringers at Guildford is somewhat detached, although work is afoot to address this.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What efforts can be made to bring bell ringers more fully into the mainstream Cathedral understanding of safeguarding? Can lessons be learned from cathedrals where bell ringing has been a particular issue?

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.

3.2.1 Effectiveness of responses

Cases relating to the Cathedral in recent years are low in number, and mainly relate to chorister welfare. The chorister welfare issues demonstrate a good level of awareness about safeguarding concerns, and an encouragingly low threshold at which issues are raised with professionals.

Case files also demonstrate evidence of good working links with the Diocese, the appropriate involvement of Local Authority Designated Officers (LADOs), and where necessary, prompt and effective use of House of Bishops' procedures. Effective joint working has been testified to by a senior officer with Surrey Police.

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

There are no safeguarding agreements currently relating to people worshipping in Guildford Cathedral.

3.2.3 Quality of recording

What paperwork the auditors saw was typically brief, but certainly clear and easy to follow. There is a potential issue that the Cathedral and the DSA could both have papers relating to cases, which carries a risk of differing versions of case files running.

3.2.4 Information sharing practice

The auditors noted positive aspects in the Cathedral's information sharing practice:

- Issues involving chorister welfare are raised cooperatively and promptly
- There are structural opportunities for boy chorister information to be shared in the regular meetings with Lanesborough School
- Good information sharing with the DSA
- The casework sub-group of the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel (DSAP) invites the CSR whenever matters relating to the Cathedral are to be discussed
- The casework sub-group agenda is shared with the CSR for every meeting, in case he is familiar with any names on it

A culture in which confidentiality is respected, but where information that should be shared is done so promptly and appropriately, is a difficult one to achieve, but is of vital importance in developing a safe environment. Everyone in the Cathedral should be supported to adhere to good information sharing practice, and leadership on this must come from a senior level.

3.2.5 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.

The Diocese of Guildford supplies Authorised Listeners to people who wish to access them, and this offer extends to people whose need for support relates to the Cathedral. The auditors are not aware of the service being used in a Cathedral context.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Can the Cathedral satisfy itself that its case paperwork works effectively alongside any held by the DSA?
- How can senior leaders, staff and volunteers be supported to develop best practice in information sharing?

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

Guildford Cathedral, like others, faces the challenge of delivering safeguarding training to a diverse and large group of staff and volunteers. The Music Department, other staff, and clergy have had training over recent years; the work to capture all volunteers has begun in earnest over the last six to nine months. Accordingly, it remains a work in progress, with about a quarter of people around the Cathedral yet to be trained.

The House of Bishops' national training programme is used. All senior clergy have received C4 training for people in their role; most other people need C1 introductory training.

C1 training over the last six months has been delivered in groups by the Chief Operating Officer (COO). The Diocese employs a Diocesan Safeguarding Training and Development Coordinator (DSTDC), who has done some work in the Cathedral, but has not had the capacity to train large numbers of Cathedral people in a short space of time. She has focused therefore on training for more specialist staff, including domestic abuse training.

The C1 sessions led by the COO now run monthly, and aim to capture staff and volunteers as part of their induction.

Analysis

The mandatory safeguarding training of volunteers is a very recent requirement. Given that, the Cathedral has made good progress, and has responded flexibly to the resistance of some volunteers to online training, and the inherent shortcomings of e-learning, by running group sessions.

These sessions, led by the COO, are very well received, and he is able to tailor them to the experience of the volunteers and the Cathedral. He does not have a professional safeguarding background, but feedback clearly supports his view that his localised knowledge, and previous experience in training, means he is capable of running the course.

Feedback about the training groups highlighted the ability to discuss issues, and have one's fears allayed, as particular positives. Not having to deal with the IT technicalities has addressed whatever resistance there has been to doing safeguarding training.

There is, however, a capacity issue, between the Cathedral and Diocese, in the delivery of training to large numbers of people. The DSAP will have a role in helping both institutions plan how, either jointly or singly, this is addressed. This should include looking at the extent to which the DSTDC can play a role in the ongoing training of Cathedral staff and volunteers.

As part of the recent efforts to train more people, the Cathedral has developed a

spreadsheet which tracks who has yet to be trained, when they have been contacted about this, and by when people need refresher training.

To further strengthen training, the provision of a mental health awareness course (see 3.1), adaptations to allow volunteers with a cognitive impairment to take part, and a policy that requires all volunteers to be trained would be beneficial (see 3.1).

Finally, the Cathedral's recent efforts have coincided with this audit, but means that there is no embedded culture that safeguarding training is undertaken by all relevant people. It is vital that going forward this momentum is continued.

Questions for Guildford Cathedral to consider:

- Can the DSAP play a role in helping the Cathedral address its capacity issues for ongoing training?
- Can training be adjusted so that vulnerable volunteers can take part?
- How can the Cathedral maintain a rigorous training programme for the future, and should that involve the DSTDC, given her expertise and the COO's other commitments?

3.5 SAFER RECRUITMENT

Description

Guildford Cathedral does not employ Human Resources (HR) staff; professional support is provided via a contract with an HR agency. At the time of the audit, the Volunteer Coordinator, working three days a week, administered the safe recruitment of all volunteers; she had, however, handed in her notice and was leaving immediately after our site visit.

DBS checks for the Cathedral are managed electronically by an agency contracted by the Diocese.

The DSA has recommended the Cathedral collect retrospective references on all its DBS-checked volunteers.

Analysis

Electronic DBS checks work smoothly and swiftly, when they are required. The question of which roles actually need one is problematic at Guildford, reflecting a national issue. This is compounded because the external agency contracted by the Diocese has a diocesan focus in its understanding of roles. For example, a parish virger and a cathedral virger have differing responsibilities, and it is not clear that the agency understands that.

The auditors examined c.25 recruitment files – of clergy, other staff, and volunteers. These were on the whole good, with evidence of DBS checks where necessary, and references being taken. A positive note to the reference request is that it specifically tells referees that the imperatives of safeguarding must outweigh any personal feelings they have for the applicant. Files do not typically have any evidence of

identity, such as a passport, and chaperone recruitment does not appear to typically involve the taking of references. Although most chaperones recruited are chorister parents, the taking of references would be an additional safeguard.

The work on safely recruiting volunteers has been led for many years by the Volunteer Coordinator, who has left the role. Her departure, with no clear plans for a replacement, leaves a significant gap in safe processes for the Cathedral in the short-to-medium term.

A number of people in various roles in and around the Cathedral raised concerns about people being asked to step into roles – including roles where safeguarding is directly relevant – for which either references had not been taken, or for which suitable training had not been completed. The number of people, each with their own perspective, was enough to alert the auditors to the fact that this is a problem, and has the effect of making staff working to recruit people safely feel that their efforts are unimportant.

Linked to this, there appear to have been people taken on, including in a key safeguarding role, without a clear picture having been provided as to what is expected of them, and with little formal induction. In a context of volunteers being hard to recruit (see section 3.1), this should be addressed.

The audits believe that an effort to retrospectively gather safeguarding references for volunteers would send a clear message about the priority afforded to safeguarding, although recognise that without a Volunteer Coordinator, this would be challenging at present.

People's recruitment details are currently held on two separate databases, which risks confusion.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the Cathedral manage the immediate need to safely recruit volunteers in the absence of a Volunteer Coordinator?
- How quickly can a system for taking references for chorister parents recruited as chaperones be put in place?
- What steps need to be taken to ensure that all staff understand, and act upon, the need for rigorously safe recruitment at all times?
- How could further formalisation of the recruitment and induction of volunteers support people to take on their new roles successfully?
- What priority should be given to a retrospective gathering of safeguarding references for volunteers?
- What stands in the way of the development of one recruitment database, akin to a Single Central Register in a school?

4 FINDINGS – ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORTS

4.1 POLICY, PROCEDURES AND GUIDANCE

Description

Guildford Cathedral, both in its own right and in partnership with the Diocese, manages its safeguarding under the various House of Bishops' policies and procedures. Locally, it has a handbook, *Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk of Harm*, last updated in January 2019. This is supplemented by a safeguarding policy statement, and aide memoires for handling disclosures and for supporting people with mental health problems.

Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk of Harm includes a Code of Conduct for staff and volunteers, and sets out expectations in relation to handling disclosures, confidentiality, and record keeping. It describes various forms of abuse, and lays out safeguarding procedures for various different roles within the Cathedral.

The policy statement is also incorporated into the safeguarding handbook, and into newly-developed Risk of Harm forms, for all external organisations – choirs, schools, bell ringers etc. – to complete when visiting or hiring the Cathedral.

The Cathedral is in the process of developing a portable card setting out key contact details, but this will need to be revised given the departure of the CSO.

Analysis

Within the small sample of cases, the auditors saw evidence of the House of Bishops' policies being used appropriately.

Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk of Harm helpfully gives bespoke detail about managing safeguarding in Guildford Cathedral. Areas for improvement include the tightening up of protocols for reporting concerns and/or disclosures, and the addition of categories of adult abuse, such as modern slavery and domestic violence, to bring the handbook in line with the Care Act 2014.

The section 'Notes for chaperones' in the handbook is relatively long and detailed, reflecting the important safeguarding role they fulfil, and is relevant only to a very small number of people. It could also benefit from further exploration of the scope of the chaperone role.

The Risk of Harm forms are a useful strengthening of procedures.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Can clarity and consistency be strengthened in *Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk of Harm*, by setting out the circumstances in which issues are brought to the attention of the CSO, CSR, and/or DSA? Should wider categories of adult abuse be included in the handbook?

- Can the notes for chaperones be turned into a separate document, and strengthened to include an expectation that monitoring for grooming be part of the role?

4.1.1 Information sharing protocols

There is a draft information sharing protocol between the Diocese of Guildford and Surrey Police, and this incorporates the Cathedral. No other protocols are currently in place. The auditors did not see evidence that this curtails appropriate joint working.

4.2 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISER/S AND CATHEDRAL SAFEGUARDING OFFICER

Description

Professional safeguarding support is provided to the Cathedral by the DSA of the Diocese of Guildford, who has been in post since 2011. There is a safeguarding working protocol between the Cathedral and the Diocese which sets out the expectations of the DSA, but there is no service level agreement or similar between the two bodies, and no money is paid to the Diocese for the DSA's time. There is a long-standing convention that the two institutions do not charge for the services each provides to the other.

The DSA is a former police officer, who worked for many years in child protection policing. He is a freelance worker, with a contract with the Diocese of Portsmouth (where he is also the DSA) which covers his work in both Portsmouth and Guildford. The contract provides for a minimum of 100 hours work per quarter for each diocese, although the DSA typically works far more than this. There is no formal apportioning of any of that diocesan time to the Cathedral; the DSA simply works there as and when necessary. Working with the Cathedral is set out in the DSA's job description.

The DSA is line managed by the Director of HR in the Diocese, and supervised by a consultant social work practitioner based within the Diocese of Portsmouth.

The work of the DSA is supplemented by that of the Diocesan Safeguarding Training and Development Coordinator (DSTDC), although as described in section 3.4, her availability to the Cathedral is limited.

Guildford Cathedral has for some years had a Cathedral Safeguarding Officer (CSO) role. Its purpose, as set out in the *Roles and Responsibilities* document, is to work with the DSA, the CSR and the Chief Operating Officer (as Cathedral Safeguarding Lead) to advise and support the Cathedral community; receive any concerns people might have; report these as appropriate; and generally to promote safeguarding across the Cathedral.

The CSO is a voluntary appointment. The CSO was first approached about the role in March 2018, but at the audit, said she had only fully been in role since late 2018. The CSO was the post leaving immediately after the site visit.

Analysis

The provision of safeguarding support to the Cathedral by the DSA is of reliably good quality. He is valued in particular for the rigour of his work, and his approachability and accessibility. The auditors have seen evidence of the DSA's strong casework.

The DSA's supervision and management arrangements are satisfactory, and there are sufficiently strong structural links between the Diocese and the Cathedral that avenues would be available to tackle any concerns should his work with the Cathedral warrant this.

The current arrangement, by which the Cathedral and Diocese have no service level agreement with each other to manage the DSA's time, works well. It brings flexibility, albeit at the expense of contractual clarity. It leaves open the possibility of a breakdown in relations leaving the Cathedral without adequate safeguarding cover, although the auditors judge this to be an unlikely scenario. The House of Bishops' guidance, *Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies* calls for an agreement between cathedrals and dioceses for the provision of safeguarding, and it is not clear if the current informal arrangement conforms to this expectation.

More urgent consideration needs to be given to the CSO role. The resignation of the last post-holder, especially when coupled with the resignation of the Volunteer Coordinator, leaves the Cathedral short-handed in key safeguarding roles.

The Cathedral is actively debating whether the CSO role should be paid. Certainly, the demands of the role mean that it requires a time commitment, and a presence in the Cathedral, which are hard to manage on a voluntary basis, and paying someone to be in the Cathedral for a specified number of hours each week would address that.

The opportunity has arisen to combine the CSO role with either the Volunteer Coordinator role, or the lead chaperone post, as these are both also vacant. It may be that the roles can be combined in some configuration, but of course the fact that the vacancies have happened to align does not inherently mean that the roles can successfully be merged.

The auditors note that the CSO prior to the person who has just left fulfilled the role on a voluntary basis for number of years, successfully by all accounts. It is, the auditors believe, possible to do the role voluntarily, although it may be that finding a volunteer with the requisite time and skills proves impossible in practice.

The nature of the role – being a bridge between the congregation/community and the paid staff and clergy of the Cathedral – would be significantly altered were the role a paid one.

Congregants to whom the auditors spoke clearly valued the CSO role. Any future person doing it must be safely recruited; transparently told what the role will involve; properly inducted; supplied with a Cathedral email address and mobile phone; and actively supported – as the last CSO was – by the CSL, CSR and DSA. Together, the auditors believe, this will make a successful appointment more likely.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Is the Cathedral satisfied with the current arrangements regarding their access to DSA support? Is it compliant with House of Bishops' expectations?
- How best can the Cathedral engage a CSO with the accessibility and availability to the Cathedral community to successfully fulfil the advice, support and liaison role?

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.

Cathedral safeguarding paperwork is kept in a locked cabinet, to which the COO has the key.

The Cathedral also holds what is characterised as archived paperwork on former choristers. It needs to be satisfied this is compliant with General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR).

The DSA records his work on a database, to which access is reserved only for him and for people who may have a legitimate interest in it, such as his line manager.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Can the Cathedral satisfy itself that it is compliant with the GDPR in the paperwork it holds?

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.

Guildford Cathedral is, aside from work with the choir, early on in its efforts to buttress its safeguarding work with formal systems. There is, accordingly, no clear framework for quality assuring its safeguarding work. The auditors note, nonetheless, a number of positive activities:

- A developing culture of learning lessons – either in formal sessions, or less structured reflections – after incidents or challenges. Examples run from the guides reflecting on managing tactile visitors, through to analysis of how to handle large events in the Cathedral
- The DSA has led reflective sessions after cases
- Staff liaise with colleagues in other cathedrals, to benchmark their work, or seek advice. An example is the COO exploring whether other cathedrals do DBS checks on virgers
- The Cathedral engages in a regional cathedral education network

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Would formalising existing benchmarking efforts and other work into a quality assurance plan or framework be useful for the Cathedral?

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.

The Cathedral does not have a complaints policy, and this needs to be addressed. And while the majority of safeguarding work is done on the Cathedral's behalf by the Diocese, it is not apparent that the Diocese has one either.

While the Cathedral does have a grievance policy for staff and volunteers, a member of the public or of the wider Cathedral community has no ready means of raising a complaint about any aspect of safeguarding.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can people with a complaint about safeguarding best be informed of who to approach? Can Guildford learn from other cathedrals with effective complaints policies?

5.3 WHISTLEBLOWING

The Diocese of Guildford has a whistleblowing protocol. It does not explicitly cover the Cathedral, but refers to people in congregations within the Diocese, so by that measure it does. It is not clear how members of the Cathedral community would readily come across the protocol.

The *Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk of Harm* handbook briefly touches on whistleblowing. Both documents point a whistleblower to the DSA if the cause for concern is a safeguarding one. This feels appropriate.

Either by strengthening what is in *Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk of Harm*, or by making the diocesan protocol more explicitly related to the Cathedral, information for potential whistleblowers in the Cathedral should be more prominent. Contact details for Protect, the charity which supports whistleblowers, could usefully be included.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the Cathedral best inform staff and volunteers of their rights and duties under whistleblowing law?

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

Guildford's DSAP is chaired by a former head teacher who also has youth work experience. She has chaired the DSAP for six years. Membership includes diocesan safeguarding staff, the Diocesan Secretary, statutory partners, two archdeacons, and the CSR.

Recently, the group has adopted terms of reference which more clearly emphasise its strategic oversight, support and challenge function, and a new casework sub-group has been formed to assist and advise the DSA. There have only been two DSAP meetings under the new system, and the terms of reference will be reviewed after a year.

In addition, a new quarterly meeting between the Diocese (in the form of the Director of HR, the DSA, the DSTDC, and the DBS administrator) and the Cathedral (in the shape of the Dean and the CSR) has been established.

Analysis

DSAP minutes suggest it functions effectively, with an appropriate focus on strategic issues. A recent meeting included survivors of clerical abuse discussing their situation with the panel, which is positive.

The auditors tried to test whether, with only one representative present, DSAP functions effectively for the Cathedral. After only two meetings under a new structure, it is too soon to tell, but the auditors accept the point of the DSAP Chair that, if the function of the group is to provide independent expert scrutiny of church safeguarding, it cannot have too many clerics or church representatives on it. The Diocese is only represented by two archdeacons.

Although the CSR only attends the case sub-group when a Cathedral-specific matter is on the agenda, he is told who is under discussion, and the auditors feel this allays any risk that matters pertinent to the Cathedral might be missed.

While it is explicit that the DSAP Chair has the right to meet with the Bishop of Guildford, and to hold him to account, there is no such clarity in relation to her links with Chapter, although the Chair herself understands she has that right.

The auditors note below that key safeguarding roles are vacant, and DSAP needs to have an overview of how this is being addressed.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- How can the independent scrutiny Chapter by the DSAP Chair be formally noted? Would amending the DSAP terms of reference be a useful approach?
- How can the Cathedral best liaise with the DSAP regarding the staffing of its safeguarding roles?

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 determine how well led the safeguarding function is.

5.5.1 Theological leadership

Description

The responsibility for theological leadership in relation to safeguarding lies with the Dean of Guildford, supported by the Cathedral clergy. The Dean has been in her role for five years, bringing to it a good deal of safeguarding experience from former clerical roles and from school governance.

Other clergy on Chapter are the Sub-Dean (the CSR, a volunteer), the Canon Liturgist and the Canon with Responsibility for Education.

The Dean sees her safeguarding role as having a 'bird's-eye view': leading Chapter in making sure the Cathedral is a safe place with an embedded safeguarding culture. The Sub-Dean/CSR also has a role in leading safeguarding from a theological perspective.

Analysis

The Dean identified that she acts as an advocate for safeguarding should people be resistant to it, or anxious about it. Such private work is evidently valuable, but the auditors note that congregants and volunteers did not feel there was much public ownership of safeguarding from Chapter. The general sense was that Chapter members could do more to publicise the importance of safeguarding, in addition to the role on the ground being played by the CSR.

It is positive that the Dean fully accepts that the decision whether to refer any safeguarding matter relating to the Cathedral to the statutory authorities lies with the DSA.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- What measures could Chapter, and in particular the Dean take – such as talking publically, endorsing the safeguarding handbook, or welcoming people to training – to emphasise their theological commitment to safeguarding?

5.5.2 Strategic leadership

Description

Strategic leadership for safeguarding rests with Chapter, with the CSR clearly having an important role to play. Safeguarding is a standing item on Chapter agendas, and the CSR provides an oral brief for that agenda item.

Analysis

Whilst safeguarding is a standing item on the Chapter agenda, in recent months it focused on the SCIE audit. In the future, it should address action planning from the audit, and outline safeguarding activity (even noting if there is nothing to report), any blemished DBS checks, numbers receiving safeguarding training etc.

To further develop safeguarding, the auditors believe a strategic plan for the short to medium term would help give impetus and direction.

The CSR role incorporates elements of theological leadership, governance, strategic leadership and, as he is someone to whom people are invited to come with concerns, operational responsibilities. To an extent, this blurring of roles is inherent in the function clergy members of Chapter play in cathedrals, and the auditors have not seen indications of it being problematic in practice. Nonetheless, it may be worth keeping the scope of the role under review.

Questions for Guildford Cathedral to consider:

- How can CSR reports to Chapter be most constructive and informative in the future?
- Can Chapter commit to a safeguarding plan, to make its strategic leadership manifest?
- How can the Cathedral keep the CSR role, which appears to function well, under review?

5.5.3 Operational leadership and management

Description

Operational management of safeguarding is the purview of the Chief Operation Officer (COO), who acts as the Cathedral Safeguarding Lead (CSL). He is not a member of Chapter, but administers it as the Chapter Clerk, and reports to every meeting as COO.

He attends the Cathedral Safeguarding Leadership Group (CSLG) along with the CSR and CSO.

Analysis

The COO, the auditors found, has proved a significant asset in putting into practice an increased focus on safeguarding. He has evidently worked hard to develop a training programme, and to draw together improved policies and procedures. He has welcomed the audit as a mechanism for formalising emerging practice in the Cathedral. The auditors share his concern that the momentum leading up to the audit will be harder to maintain once it is completed.

The CSLG appears to be a good forum for making operational decisions in support of safeguarding. The auditors believe it could serve a useful function in making operational any strategy issued by Chapter (see above).

Questions for Guildford Cathedral to consider:

- Can the CSLG act as a working group to deliver a safeguarding strategy?

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.

Safeguarding is one of many things Guildford Cathedral has to do, and it faces a

challenge to embed it sufficiently in the culture so that even when other issues are to the fore, safeguarding remains robust. The auditors judged that strong recent progress has been made here, but more remains to be done, in order for safeguarding to be central in Cathedral life.

The sense of recent progress was shared internally and externally, with senior external figures recognising real improvements from a worrying situation two or three years ago. But from the Dean downwards, there is an acceptance that more work is required. The auditors recognise the Cathedral's challenges. Finances are limited, and not all roles can be done by paid staff, yet the decline in volunteering means it can be hard to find people to fill key roles.

The auditors concluded that volunteers have not been engaged with regularly about safeguarding until very recently. This has meant that the recent push to have people trained has felt a little rushed and out of the blue. And so while safeguarding awareness feels well embedded for many paid staff, the auditors believe this is still a developing area for the wider community.

The auditors also heard, often enough for it to be noted as a concern, that at a senior level, safeguarding meetings and activities are not prioritised as they should be, and one person raised a specific concern that challenges to this are not welcomed.

Ongoing improvements in safeguarding culture risk being delayed in the short to medium term because of the departure of the CSO, the lead chaperone and the Volunteer Coordinator. The Cathedral should balance the pressing matter of filling these posts with reflection upon whether these departures are or indicative of any wider concern.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider:

- Linked to previous questions, how Chapter set out a plan for further embedding safeguarding as a priority, and as a positive message about keeping people safe?
- Is there a concern that recent staff departures are reflective of a wider issue with safeguarding?

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.

Guildford Cathedral has made significant improvements in safeguarding, with many more people trained, better structures in place, and improved policies and procedures.

The safe management of the choirs, and the support for chorister welfare, is a notable strength, and sets a clear benchmark for other aspects of Cathedral safeguarding. There is generally good work taking place in supporting children and vulnerable adults safely in the Cathedral.

Clergy and paid staff generally have a good understanding of safeguarding, and many sound practices come as second nature to people.

Volunteers have a wider range of safeguarding understanding, and confidence in handling potential issues.

There are chinks in safe recruitment practices. These should be addressed by everyone, including those at a senior level, to embed a universal respect for safeguarding practice.

The Cathedral faces an immediate concern in that key safeguarding roles are vacant, which creates a risk in the ongoing safe management of people, and will cause a delay in building on recent improvements. Conversely, the vacancies create an opportunity to re-think how safeguarding is most effectively handled in the Cathedral.

An ongoing challenge will be to maintain the good momentum of recent months. In an environment where time, money and energy will always have competing calls on them, doing this will require a cohesive effort, led by Chapter.

7 APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS

DATA COLLECTION

Information provided to auditors

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

- An overview of the Cathedral and its staffing structures
- A map of the Cathedral
- Self-audits about safeguarding from a range of people, and an overview of these from the Chief Operating Officer
- Roles and responsibilities of the Cathedral Safeguarding Lead; the Cathedral Safeguarding Officer; and the Chapter Safeguarding Representative
- Job description of the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser
- Minutes of recent Chapter meetings and Cathedral Safeguarding Leadership Group meetings
- Safeguarding training records for staff and volunteers in the Cathedral
- Guildford Cathedral's procedures for safeguarding: Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk of Harm (January 2019)
- Guildford Cathedral's safeguarding policy statement
- Aide memoires for supporting people with mental health problems, and for dealing with a disclosure of abuse
- Diocese of Guildford's whistleblowing procures
- Protocol for the assessment of positive safeguarding information from organisations visiting or hiring the Cathedral
- Safeguarding risk assessment framework
- Safeguarding Risk of Harm forms for visiting choirs, visiting bell ringers, and visiting educational organisations
- Safeguarding working protocol between the Diocese of Guildford and Guildford Cathedral

During the audit, the auditors were supplied with minutes of the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel.

Participation of members of the cathedral and diocese

The auditors had conversations with:

- Dean of Guildford
- Chief Operating Officer/Cathedral Safeguarding Lead
- Chapter Safeguarding Representative
- Dean's Virger
- Cathedral Safeguarding Officer
- Head of the Schools and Family Learning Department

- Chief Guide
- Volunteer Coordinator
- Head Server
- Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser
- Canon with Responsibility for Education Organist & Master of the Choristers
- Head of Lanesborough School

Focus groups were held with:

- Choristers from both choirs
- Parents of choristers from both choirs
- Congregants
- Staff and volunteers

What records / files were examined?

The auditors looked at four safeguarding cases, and the recruitment files of one clergy, seven lay staff and 20 volunteers.