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independent safeguarding audit
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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.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE AUDIT PROGRAMME

1.1.1 SCIE is conducting an independent audit of the safeguarding arrangements of the cathedrals of the Church of England (CoFE). This programme of work will see all the CoFE’s cathedrals audited between late 2018 and early 2021. It represents an important opportunity to support improvement in safeguarding.

1.1.2 All cathedrals are unique and differ in significant ways from a diocese. SCIE has drawn on its experience of auditing all 42 CoFE 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

1.2.1 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.

1.2.2 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 CoFE 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

1.3.1 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 is 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

1.3.2 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**

1.3.3 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.

1.3.4 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.

**1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT**

This report is divided into:

- Introduction
- The findings of the audit presented per theme
- Questions for each cathedral to consider, where relevant, listed 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

2.1.1 The leadership in each cathedral, as part of the audit process, is asked to supply a brief description of the institution. Wakefield Cathedral stated:

‘God has been worshipped at the heart of Wakefield for over a thousand years, though the present building dates from the middle of the twelfth century. When the Diocese of Wakefield was created in 1888 the Parish Church of All Saints became the cathedral church for the new Diocese and Wakefield was elevated to city status. In 2014 the Dioceses of Wakefield, Bradford and Rippon were combined to form the Diocese of Leeds. We are now one of the three cathedrals in the same Diocese.

Since the reordering of the nave and east end (completed in 2016), the renewed building has become increasingly in demand as a venue for services, concerts, educational activities and special events/exhibitions. The cathedral has its own café and gift shop.’

2.1.2 The Cathedral sits in the centre of Wakefield which, in common with other post-industrial towns and cities, has faced considerable economic and social challenges in recent decades. More recently, the economic state of many of the mining towns and villages around the city has started to improve due to the booming economy in Leeds and the increase in the number of commuters living in and around Wakefield. The local Business Improvement District has been active in supporting retail and commercial enterprises in the city and there are plans for regeneration of Wakefield City Centre and Cathedral Quarter. The city and district are also home to two cultural institutions of national significance – the West Yorkshire Sculpture Park and the Hepworth Gallery – and there is a thriving local arts scene.

2.1.3 The cathedral’s core value is to be a place of welcome and conversation for people of all faiths and none. It is also to be a cultural hub in the city centre, trying to give priority to those who are needy or disadvantaged – making public a desire that all those who live in Wakefield will come inside the cathedral at least once a year. It also sits as a parish church.

2.1.4 The city of Wakefield now has a population of c.100,000. The local authority is Wakefield Council and the city is served by West Yorkshire Police.

2.1.5 Wakefield is a diverse city with citizens from more than 50 different nations from all over the world. It is a dispersal centre for those seeking asylum in the UK where accommodation is provided prior to moving to other areas in the North East region. This contributes to the diversity of those living in the city. Wakefield also has a number of homeless people sleeping rough in the city and vicinity of the Cathedral.

2.1.6 The cathedral’s financial position remains challenging with insufficient funds available to cover anything but basic costs and so the Cathedral relies on its team of volunteers and supporters. Wakefield Cathedral is relatively small, with 13 staff and 124 volunteers.
2.2 CONTEXTUAL FEATURES RELEVANT TO SAFEGUARDING

2.2.1 Wakefield Cathedral was largely rebuilt in the mid-to-late 1800s, with an addition of the east end extension containing St Mark’s Chapel in the early 1900s, though still with relatively few small spaces that are common to many English cathedrals. It also has an extensive crypt area in which meeting rooms and vestries are enclosed. As a result of Heritage Lottery Funding between 2013 and 2017, the nave of the Cathedral was renovated – removing the pews and creating an open public space leading up to the quire and sanctuary. This was generally reported as being positive in terms of safeguarding, allowing good vantage points and meaning that conversations with potentially distressed individuals can be held confidentially but in sight of others, if needed.

2.2.2 The cathedral has five entrance points for the public, including a route of disabled access, and a welcome desk in the main nave. There is no charge for admission.

2.2.3 In 1982, the Treacy Hall was built as a modern addition to the Cathedral. It connects to the nave and contains the café, gift shop and public toilets. It also contains the Song School which is accessed via a staircase from the connecting passage to the nave.

2.2.4 Bell-ringing takes place in the tower which is accessed from inside the Cathedral, close to the west door entrance.

2.2.5 The Cathedral building is used by the community to host a variety of events such as formal dinners within the nave, concerts and a range of educational activities. The café in the Treacy Hall also provides a space for other community outreach gatherings such as the weekly craft event.

2.2.6 The size of the Cathedral’s budget limits its flexibility in how it responds to any issue, including safeguarding. There is also a current challenge to capacity as the Cathedral is down one residentiary commissioner’s Canon, though recruitment is in progress.

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

2.3.1 The Dean of Wakefield, as the lead figure in all aspects of Cathedral life, carries the ultimate responsibility for safeguarding. Supporting him in this are:

- The Canon Precentor who supports the Dean as the only current residentiary Canon and holds the role of Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, also with responsibility for the music department, volunteer team and community outreach.
- The Canon for Congregational Development. Currently vacant, this position would ordinarily hold the role of Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead.
- The Chief Operating Officer (COO) who oversees recruitment and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks as well as the Cathedral’s business functions.
- The Director of Music, reporting to the Canon Precentor, who has oversight of
the choir and therefore accountability for its safety and welfare.

- The Head Verger who ensures the safety and security of the Cathedral buildings and reports to the COO and Canon Precentor.
- The Volunteer Coordinator who oversees the recruitment and induction of volunteers and reports to the Dean.
- The Cathedral Safeguarding Officer (CSO) who is a point of contact within the cathedral for safeguarding concerns.
- The Children’s Advocate who offers advocacy and support for children with welfare or safeguarding needs.
- The Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor (DSA) and Diocesan Secretary who provide a level of safeguarding support to the Cathedral.

2.3.2 The Cathedral’s team of senior clergy is currently reduced to two – the Dean and the Canon Precentor, with recruitment underway to appoint a replacement Canon for Congregational Development. This places an understandable strain on the capacity of the remaining clergy to fulfil their roles and responsibilities as well as drive change and improvements in safeguarding.

2.3.3 Currently the Cathedral does not have a Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel (CSAP) and so the governance of safeguarding sits with Chapter, which meets monthly, and within the Dean’s leadership team meetings.

2.3.4 The Cathedral has strong links with the Diocese of Leeds and a Service Level Agreement (SLA) is in place, providing access to three DSAs including a nominated Cathedral link, for support in case work, allegations management, policy and practice advice and training support. There is a representative of the three cathedrals on the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel (DSAP) (locally called the Strategic Safeguarding Group), though this is currently the Dean of Bradford and not the Dean of Wakefield. All Deans are invited to periodic ‘Lessons Learned’ meetings held by the Diocesan Secretary and DSAs.

2.4 WHO WAS SEEN IN THIS AUDIT

2.4.1 The audit involved reviewing documentation, auditing case files and talking to people at the heart of safeguarding in the cathedral, such as the Dean, Chapter members, safeguarding staff, music leads, the tower captain, community outreach and people managing the floor of the Cathedral. Safeguarding was also discussed with a number of focus groups including volunteers and parents and children involved in the choir. The site visit to the cathedral lasted 2.5 days. Further details are provided in the appendix.

Any limitations to audit

2.4.2 The CSO was unavailable during the audit visit to participate in the ongoing process. A conversation was held between the CSO and an auditor in advance of the visit, by telephone.
3 FINDINGS – PRACTICE

3.1 SAFE ACTIVITIES AND WORKING PRACTICES

Precincts and buildings

3.1.1 Managing the wellbeing of large numbers of worshippers and visitors across the Cathedral is a complex task. The auditors judged that the staff and volunteers at Wakefield Cathedral do this well.

Description

3.1.2 Wakefield Cathedral is located in the centre of Wakefield, and therefore easily accessible to workers, shoppers, students and others as they make use of the city.

3.1.3 The management of the site is primarily the work of the verger team which is led by the Head Verger, who has worked at the Cathedral for 34 years. This was initially as a cleaner before becoming a full-time caretaker. She was subsequently promoted to the Head Verger role, over 10 years ago. She is supported by two other full-time vergers and a ‘bank’ verger. None of the team live on site.

3.1.4 The vergers are line managed by the COO and the Canon Precentor. The verger team have all completed foundation (C1) training.

3.1.5 The vergers are on-site from 7am each morning, opening the cathedral at 7.45am for morning services. They are also responsible for closing each evening which can be late if an event is running. The vergers sometimes work alone and this is primarily in the morning before other clergy, staff and volunteers arrive. At points of closing, there are ordinarily other staff and clergy on site to support and so lone working is less common. There is no clear lone working policy or procedure currently in place. The auditors heard how there is a draft policy awaiting Chapter approval, but did not see it during this audit.

3.1.6 The vergers do encounter homeless people sleeping rough around the Cathedral upon opening, and they are largely well known to the team. Hot drinks are offered if needed, in addition to signposting to local support services and shelters.

3.1.7 The auditors heard that antisocial behaviour is relatively uncommon in the area surrounding the Cathedral and in the nave itself. Where individuals do enter the Cathedral and present a safety concern, the verger team tackle this with support from the police when required. Where drug paraphernalia or alcohol receptacles are discovered in the Cathedral grounds, a sharps kit and personal protective equipment are available to remove them. Recently, drug paraphernalia was discovered in the public toilets in Treacy Hall. On the advice of police, these toilets are now locked with a key obtained from the café if the public wish to use them.

3.1.8 The Cathedral outsources security services to a third party company who provide a remote night-guard, daytime support in emergencies and monitored personal alarms for use by staff and volunteers at the Cathedral who work
alone. The security provider will principally respond to alarms at the Cathedral during the night and be first on the scene, subsequently joined by a member of the verger team. From within the Cathedral, a printed report can be generated that details any alarm activity, including deactivations. This allows for monitoring of who is on site, out of opening hours, by virtue of individuals having fobs to control the alarm system. There is no internal CCTV system at the Cathedral.

3.1.9 The vergers do not have an internal radio system for communication with each other and other people staffing the cathedral. They use mobile phones or face-to-face communication. The vergers do have access to a ‘CCTV radio’ service so information about risks and missing people can be shared quickly. This links with the local police, security guards and businesses and, if used, triggers the external CCTV monitoring system around the city centre.

3.1.10 The Cathedral holds fortnightly ‘short’ diary meetings at which each department is represented, including clergy. These are supported by a ‘long’ diary meeting every three months. This is an opportunity to discuss upcoming events and schedules for use of the Cathedral.

3.1.11 There is no formal lockdown or missing child/adult procedure in place though vergers have established informal procedures to deal with suspicious packages.

3.1.12 Vergers have not received any other specific training, though a wish for de-escalation training has been expressed by some in the team.

Analysis

3.1.13 The auditors judged that the well-resourced verger team were effective in their arrangements for the safety and security of the site, as well as all those working in and visiting the cathedral.

3.1.14 The management of the premises works well. The auditors saw evidence that the vergers and other departments within the Cathedral work as a team in terms of safeguarding.

3.1.15 The verger team has a good knowledge of the local area and local challenges, and bring this to bear in its work with those who visit the Cathedral, in particular the vulnerable adults. This was evidenced by the overwhelming message heard by the auditors of trust, recognition and reliance on the verger team for support. There was also evidence of an inclusive approach on their part, and on that of the Cathedral volunteers, to recognise safety as a priority.

3.1.16 The auditors judged that, in some areas, this high level of competence was based on an in-depth experience of the Cathedral, as opposed to formalised or written procedures. Where this effective practice is reliant on individual assumed ways of working, there is the risk that were any member of the team, including key members like the Head Verger, to move on from the Cathedral, this experience could be lost. A handbook and written procedures for managing safety would help to mitigate against this risk. Capturing the existing experience of the teams already working in these areas would make this process relatively straightforward. Areas where this would be most useful include:
Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the Cathedral capture the good practice evident into more formalised and written procedures, involving the verger team in their development?
- How can the Cathedral best ensure that, when help or support is needed, it can be accessed reliably and promptly?

Vulnerable adults

Description

3.1.18 With a city centre location, and a mission of welcome, Wakefield Cathedral engages regularly with vulnerable adults which include a small number of homeless people. All are welcomed to come into the cathedral to warm up or sit quietly. The Cathedral also acts as a collection point for donations to the local food bank. This is in addition to a regular congregation in whom, by virtue of a number of factors, vulnerabilities are recognised.

3.1.19 In the past, the Cathedral has offered other means of support to the homeless including transport vouchers. However, there was a feeling expressed to the auditors that this was abused by some in receipt of this support and so it was discontinued.

3.1.20 Wakefield has a limited number of support organisations for vulnerable adults, and the Cathedral has established links with those that are in place. These include St Catherine’s Church which offers a soup kitchen, Wakefield Baptist Church which operates a night shelter when temperatures drop below zero and Marsh Way House, which offers support and accommodation for the homeless and other vulnerable people.

3.1.21 Wakefield, as a dispersal centre for asylum-seekers, encounters and engages with a number of those who may be vulnerable by virtue of their experiences. There is a large transient population of Iranian asylum-seekers and the Cathedral has, in the past, run ministry groups and offered baptism for them. The reduction in clergy capacity has limited this outreach in recent months and the majority of this engagement has moved to another local church.
3.1.22 As part of its mission of outreach, the Cathedral has, in the past, established several groups and activities to encourage and welcome visitors – some of whom are vulnerable adults. This has included a film club, which ended in December 2019, and an ongoing craft group, board game club and art walks which are supported by the Community Outreach Officer and a team of volunteers.

3.1.23 A number of staff and volunteers are in roles which bring them into contact with vulnerable visitors. As well as vergers, much of this contact falls to volunteer ‘welcomers’ who can call on the clergy for support with anybody seeking prayer and guidance.

3.1.24 The Canon Precentor, together with the Volunteer Coordinator, has introduced safeguarding checks as part of standard recruitment for new volunteers, together with the Cathedral’s own induction training on working with vulnerable adults and safeguarding. Retrospective recruitment checks and training for all volunteers, using the CofE’s own suite of safeguarding training, are yet to be rolled-out. The auditors heard how volunteers across the Cathedral, café and shop are able to support those who are vulnerable and report concerns largely by virtue of their experience and understanding.

3.1.25 The volunteer welcome team have not taken part in any additional training to support them in their contact with vulnerable adults, though a will was expressed to undertake training in providing bereavement support and in local routes of help available to the homeless. The Community Outreach Officer has undertaken an additional ‘Dementia Friends’ training, delivered by the Alzheimer’s Society.

Analysis

3.1.26 The auditors judged that the provision for vulnerable adults is an area of real strength in the Cathedral and that there are visible efforts to make the Cathedral a safe, inclusive and welcoming place for all.

3.1.27 There is a good understanding of visitors as potentially vulnerable adults across many teams that the auditors spoke with. Volunteer induction training specifically includes the recognition of vulnerability in visitors and supportive ways of working that enable the Cathedral to be a safe and welcoming place. The auditors were also struck by the knowledge and monitoring of key individuals who are regular visitors and a sensitivity to recognising changes in their needs.

3.1.28 Beyond visitors, cathedrals may include volunteers and staff who are themselves, by virtue of a number of factors, vulnerable. The auditors saw evidence that this was well understood within the Cathedral, and particularly so within the volunteer body. The mechanisms introduced by the Volunteer Coordinator to induct new volunteers, such as an initial three-month and annual review programme, were used to enable monitoring of any needs or vulnerabilities and to ensure any necessary support is provided in a timely way.

3.1.29 In the context of the challenge of resource availability, and reduction in direct funding through the Heritage Lottery Fund (described further in 3.1.30), there was evidence of a wide outreach offer for adults, including regular groups
which the Cathedral organises and supports. The Cathedral and Community Outreach Officer, supported by volunteers, have worked hard to maintain a range of activities. This means that actually or potentially vulnerable adults are very much at the heart of the Cathedral, which is not necessarily commonplace across other cathedrals and the auditors feel sets Wakefield apart.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- There were no considerations raised under this heading.

Children

This section is about children who come to the Cathedral in various capacities. It does not cover choristers who are referred to in the next section.

Description

3.1.30 Between 2013 and 2017, Wakefield Cathedral was the beneficiary of Heritage Lottery Funding which included a history and heritage educational outreach arm. This allowed the Cathedral to hire one full-time and one-part time Community Outreach Officer to run a large programme of opportunities for schools and children. At the conclusion of this funding in December 2017, both of these roles were restructured (in April 2018) and replaced with one part-time Community Outreach Officer.

3.1.31 Despite this, Wakefield Cathedral has continued to have an active community outreach programme of school visits, with 33 visits taking place in 2018 involving children from preschool through to further education. The Community Outreach Officer runs the majority of school visits alone but is supported by a team of education volunteers and wider cathedral volunteers where needed and for larger groups.

3.1.32 The Community Outreach Officer is a teacher by background, joining the cathedral in 2015 through a safer recruitment process and is line managed by the Dean. She has undertaken foundation (C1) training and completed foundation and leadership (C3) training through a role in a different church. The education department volunteers are yet to complete safeguarding training. More recent cathedral volunteers have completed induction and the Cathedral’s own safeguarding training. For those volunteers whose roles require one, a DBS check is in place.

3.1.33 The community outreach team principally hosts children on school visits in the nave of the Cathedral, with some activities taking place within the education room located in the Cathedral Centre or the cathedral grounds. Most groups can be easily accommodated in these spaces. Teachers retain responsibility for children at all times and all visits are risk assessed prior to the date of the visit. Children are greeted at the entrance to the Cathedral. The Community Outreach Officer has established relationships with a group of local schools and also offers visits to the schools for assemblies and workshops (e.g. a demonstration and activity on the labyrinth found on the nave floor, using a canvas model).

3.1.34 Photographs can be a concern at school visits, usually being taken by those
visiting the cathedral at the same time. The community outreach team, volunteers and vergers are on hand to challenge this and to ask visitors not to photograph children.

3.1.35 In addition to school visits, the Cathedral holds other groups for children including ‘Messy Cathedral’ which offers creative activities and runs on Sunday mornings, with children always accompanied by a parent or carer.

3.1.36 On arrival at the Cathedral for a school visit, children and teachers are given a safety briefing which includes safeguarding aspects and fire/evacuation procedures – signposting other volunteers and the verger team. As stated in 3.1.9, there is no internal radio system for seeking help or support in emergencies; there is an accepted practice of either finding a verger or other member of staff or clergy or using a verger’s mobile phone number.

3.1.37 Wakefield Cathedral does have children who are servers. The server team is led by the Head Server who has had a DBS check, as have all other adult servers. There is therefore always a DBS checked adult present when children are part of the server team. Some have received safeguarding training but this is, as is true in other areas of the cathedral, a work in progress.

3.1.38 Children and bell-ringing is addressed further in 3.2.

Analysis

3.1.39 The auditors judged that there is a wide range of safely managed outreach provision for children, especially given the context of the resources available to the Cathedral. This includes both visits to the cathedral and involvement in outside activities, such as school assemblies.

3.1.40 School visits, led by a well-experienced Community Outreach Officer, are managed safely and carefully consider wellbeing. There are tried and tested processes for running these visits that include a safety briefing to children and teachers upon their arrival, which demonstrates a good understanding of the potential risks.

3.1.41 Given the reduction in funding for outreach and a dramatic shrinkage to the team (now solely comprising one part-time Community Outreach Officer) the legacy of activity has been maintained and a large number of activities continue. This enables children to be welcomed into the Cathedral and benefit from the opportunities available.

3.1.42 The auditors heard evidence of good, established relationships with schools that have been maintained over time. This means that the Cathedral not only hosts a relatively large number of educational visits but is also invited to go into local schools and deliver assemblies.

3.1.43 For those volunteers working directly with children, both in the context of school visits to the Cathedral, children’s groups and in bell-ringing, the lack of safeguarding training means that they are not equipped with all of the understanding of safeguarding that they could be, and that would underpin safety. This is an area that should be a priority as part of the Cathedral’s training programme.
Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the Cathedral ensure that all volunteers who work directly with children are equipped with safeguarding training, as a priority?

3.2 CHOIRS AND MUSIC

Choir

Description

3.2.1 Wakefield has a large choir comprising some 36 choristers which has been growing within the Cathedral and more nationally since 2002. They were described as increasingly ‘professionalised’ and, given the size of the cathedral, ‘boxing above their weight’ in reputation and activity.

3.2.2 Wakefield’s choristers are led by the Director of Music who has been in post for 10 years and prior to that was the Assistant Director of Music from 2002. They are supported by an Assistant Director of Music. The Director of Music reports directly to the Canon Precentor and has undertaken safeguarding for senior leaders (C4) training, while the Assistant Director of Music has completed foundation (C1) training.

3.2.3 Until 2015, the Song School was situated in the crypt, next to a communal breakout space in what was historically the Chapter house. The Song School was moved as part of the Heritage Lottery Fund project, which requested that the Chapter house be returned to its use as a meeting room. The Song School then moved above the Treacy Hall corridor, with the practice room and robing area secured behind a code-locked door. At this time the breakout space was held in the Treacy Hall. Due to concerns about supervision and public access to the café and toilets the breakout space returned to the crypt in 2018. As part of the ongoing planning of the development of Cathedral Quarter, there is an ambition for a new building to house the Song School in future years to create a bespoke space that better meets the choir’s needs.

3.2.4 During rehearsal times, the cathedral café and Treacy Hall is closed to the public and entrance secured with code-locked doors. These codes are now changed periodically and both choristers and parents have access to them. Choristers use the toilets within Treacy Hall, which remain locked to the public (see 3.1.7).

3.2.5 Wakefield Cathedral does not have a formally associated choir school and so both girl and boy choristers are selected from a wide range of schools in the local area, although largely from local independent schools. Choristers range in age from 7–18 years. Recently, the Cathedral has introduced a service to transport children from one local collection point to rehearsals.

3.2.6 Boy choristers rehearse on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday evenings and alternate between the two services on Sundays. Girl Choristers rehearse on Wednesday and Friday evenings and also alternate the two Sunday services. Boys sing Evensong on Tuesdays with girls’ Evensong on Wednesdays. Boys and girls alternate Thursday Evensong. In addition, there is a junior boys’ choir which rehearses on Tuesday evening. Lay clerks, which include some
children between 16 and 18 years of age, rehearse and perform on Thursdays and Sundays.

3.2.7 The choristers are chaperoned by a combination of volunteers and parents, on a rota basis. On Tuesdays, Fridays and, informally, on Sundays, this is fulfilled by a volunteer with parents staffing the other weekday rehearsals and services. Choristers are dropped at rehearsals by parents or, if older, make their own way to the Cathedral. On arrival, they make their way to the Song School and are greeted by chaperones and the Director/Assistant Director of Music. In a recent change, the chaperones role now involves sitting in on rehearsals in addition to escorting children to the toilet and supervising them in the den, on movement around the cathedral and while in the quire. At the end of Evensong, choristers are greeted by parents in the Treacy Hall corridor and supervised by clergy, the Director/Assistant Director of Music and chaperones.

3.2.8 Expectations (including about behaviour) and pertinent information are provided to choristers and their parents through the Chorister Guide. This includes information on safeguarding and the appropriate use of social media and key safeguarding contacts (although does not include details of the CSO or the Children’s Advocate).

3.2.9 Chorister information (including emergency details) is shared with the cathedral and stored in paper form in the Song School at all times. Recently, the ‘ChurchSuite’ software – a secure web-based church database management system - has been introduced and there has been a move to include this information there for ease of access. It is hoped that this will make it easier for parents to update chorister details to ensure the Cathedral holds the most current information. Going forward, this will also provide a forum for managing and organising the chaperone rota and for generating communication with parents.

3.2.10 Choristers undertake regular tours, both nationally and internationally (including Poland in the summer of 2019). The Director of Music assumes responsibility for the planning of these and risk assessments are undertaken, detailed timetables put together for each tour and a team of experienced chaperones, staff and clergy attend and support. Choristers are provided with staff contact numbers should they need them, and emergency details and contact information are taken.

3.2.11 A ‘worry box’, for choristers to confidentially raise concerns is situated in the crypt and checked regularly, though to date it has not been used.

3.2.12 Wakefield has a group of lay clerks who sing alongside the choir but have no direct responsibility for them. As is the experience of some other cathedrals, it has not been possible to obtain an enhanced DBS for these roles. Instead, a quarter are designated as having chaperone duties for choir tours and so have had an enhanced DBS undertaken. All other lay clerks have completed confidential declarations. Not all lay clerks have completed valid safeguarding training. There is a Lay Clerk Guide in place which outlines expectations and rehearsal and service details. However, it does not make clear the safeguarding expectations placed on clerks with regard to conduct with younger choristers (including use of social media). Key safeguarding contact information is also out of date.
3.2.13 The Cathedral has several choral or organ scholars. Organ scholars are normally over 18 years and are subject to the safer recruitment process. Choral scholars are 16–18 and tend to be ex-choristers. The Cathedral currently has one junior organ scholar who is a sixth former. Organ scholars may page-turn for the organist during services. The organist is located in the organ loft which, unlike many cathedrals, is visible from the cathedral floor. The cathedral does not provide accommodation for scholars.

3.2.14 The music department has a detailed health and safety risk assessment, currently in draft form pending Chapter approval.

Analysis

3.2.15 The auditors judged that there are many positives about the choir, the music department, its leadership and impact. They were also told of a number of changes and improvements for the safety of children, in the past few months. These are appreciated by all. Nonetheless, there are a number of areas where improvements need to be made.

3.2.16 The choir at Wakefield Cathedral is well established and of a high quality, and this is appreciated by the children and parents that were spoken to. The longevity of children in the choir, together with the size of both the boys’ and girls’ choirs, is testament to how well this works.

3.2.17 There is a culture of learning and openness to change within the music department and this is evidenced through the processes and procedures that have been introduced more recently to strengthen safeguarding. In particular, changes to the choir and lay clerk handbooks to include clear expectations on the use of social media and new, more robust arrangements for chaperoning have helped to strengthen safeguarding and the supervision of choristers.

3.2.18 The music department offers an ambitious programme of tours which, the auditors judged, adds considerably to the children’s development and pleasure. These tours are planned with robust assessments of risk and safeguarding arrangements.

3.2.19 Communication with the parents, particularly regarding safeguarding changes – of which there have been many recently – is challenging. In one example, the auditors learned that the introduction of new signing-in and -out procedures for choristers was not known by two parents and chaperones, for several months after their introduction. However, the auditors also recognised the perspective of some within the Cathedral that communication is a ‘two-way street’: parents need to be responsive and use appropriate communication means for this to be effective. The Director of Music is aware of these issues and felt that some communication efforts by him and his team had not worked well, mentioning in particular that it is hard to get all parents to come along to key meetings. It was apparent to the auditors that a variety of channels of communication need to be opened in order for all parents to receive and understand pertinent information. The auditors heard how there is an ambition that the new ‘ChurchSuite’ system will make this easier, but also heard evidence from some parents that this was not seen as particularly effective.

3.2.20 The auditors heard from some choristers that there is a reluctance to share
concerns relating to welfare with the Director of Music, at times describing themselves as fearful of an angry response. The view of parents was somewhat polarised on this issue, with some also sharing a reticence to raise concerns and others describing a very open and effective dialogue and confidence in a robust response to any concerns raised. The auditors recognised this in a wider sense of conflict among parents about how the choir is run.

3.2.21 The auditors saw and heard evidence that, despite changes, the chaperone arrangements are not always effective. These arrangements need to be reviewed, with the understanding that the system needs to offer consistency and, if possible, a degree of independence in the chaperones. This would ensure that children are able to establish a trusting relationship with chaperones and experience consistent application of rules – for example, about the use of mobile phones. Doing so is challenging in the context of limited resources, however, the auditors feel that there is the potential for wide-ranging positive implications from prioritising this.

3.2.22 The auditors heard how the timetable in the Sunday morning choral services (09.15 and then 11.00) places additional strain on the Director of Music and compromises the ability to meet and supervise choristers arriving for the second service of the day, prepare them for the performance and handle any wellbeing concerns within the constraints of the tight schedule.

3.2.23 Given the experiences of the music department in safeguarding and implementing change, and as an area for likely future growth and development within the Cathedral, it is important that there is an inclusion of the Director and/or the Assistant Director of Music in any future operational safeguarding meetings (discussed further below). This may help to ensure that changes going forward are made collaboratively.

3.2.24 Since the current Director of Music has been in post, real efforts have been made to rebalance the historic gender gap in status, opportunities and performance obligations. This has generally been received positively by choristers. Where choristers feel that they are equally valued and have equal voice, they are more likely to feel able to raise concerns on a level with their peers, therefore fostering a safer and more open system.

**Questions for the Cathedral to consider**

- Is the current arrangement of chaperones working effectively to ensure consistency and a degree of independence?
- How might the Cathedral better ensure clear and effective communication with chorister parents?
- How can the Cathedral capture the experiences of the music department in wider safeguarding mechanisms, going forwards?

**Bell-ringing**

3.2.25 Wakefield Cathedral has had a continuous band of ringers since 1947.

3.2.26 The Tower Captain had been in post from 1986 until 2017 and took over from his father who was Tower Captain from almost the inception of the bell
ringers' band. From 2017 he became the Acting Tower Captain, due to breaks and a sabbatical, with the role being taken over by a succession of other interim Tower Captains, who did not remain in post for long. There is no current Assistant Tower Captain, but there is a plan to recruit one to job-share with the incumbent for at least part of the year.

3.2.27 The current Acting Tower Captain does have a DBS, as do a number of other ringers for the purposes of being able to have two DBS checked adults in the tower at all times when attended by children. However, neither the Acting Tower Captain nor bell-ringers have received safeguarding training.

3.2.28 There are good links between the tower, the Cathedral and the Canon Precentor as Chapter Safeguarding Lead, and regular contact is maintained to share important information and check on arrangements.

3.2.29 The tower itself is accessed from inside the Cathedral with a separate locked door from the nave to the tower stairs. The auditors were made aware of one instance where a member of the public tried to access the tower but was stopped by vergers.

3.2.30 The Acting Tower Captain does have occasion to lone-work at times but there is no formal Cathedral process for ensuring that this is done so safely. Following a recent incident of a ringer being accosted by a member of the public when leaving the Cathedral following rehearsal, this is now done as part of a group to ensure safety. The area surrounding the cathedral and car park is well lit at night.

3.2.31 Limited checks are made of visiting parties of bell-ringers and whether any of them are subject to a safeguarding agreement, or have similar restrictions. A list of names is requested prior to the visit, which is shared with the Dean, for the purposes of checking restrictions, but it is acknowledged that this would not limit someone from attending if their name is not on the list.

3.2.32 Currently there are two children who ring bells at the Cathedral. Responsibility for children is assumed at the Cathedral doors and there are always two DBS checked adults present at all times. Parents are encouraged to remain with their child during teaching sessions in the tower. As noted above, the Acting Tower Captain has a DBS in place, but has not undertaken safeguarding training.

Analysis

3.2.33 The auditors judge that the Cathedral benefits from a remarkably experienced and committed Acting Tower Captain and team, and from their close relationship with the Cathedral.

3.2.34 The auditors were struck by the degree to which the bell tower feels a part of the Cathedral with integral and close links with key members of staff and clergy. This is often not the case, with a degree of detachment or isolation relatively commonplace. This is possibly, at least in part, due to the longevity of the current Acting Tower Captain and the relationships that have been established over a long involvement at the Cathedral. Safeguarding this in any future arrangements for leadership of bell-ringing is important.

3.2.35 Despite this close working in practice, the auditors heard how the bell tower
had experienced issues in the sharing of safeguarding information which affected awareness of wider cathedral processes and controls. This was particularly true of policy. This creates a risk that, for example, where the bell-ringers in the Cathedral as volunteers are the responsibility of the Acting Tower Captain and not the Volunteer Coordinator, their safeguarding training requirements can be overlooked.

3.2.36 Despite not receiving any safeguarding training, the auditors saw one example of a safeguarding case in which timely action was taken to ensure the safety and wellbeing of bell-ringers. This involved close and effective working with the cathedral and other bodies.

3.2.37 Bell towers inherently present risks to the health of safety of those that use them. The auditors heard how, though involved in a risk assessment of the bell tower approximately seven years ago, the Acting Tower Captain has not been involved in any renewal of this. This should be a priority in line with the Cathedral’s efforts to risk assess other areas of the site and activities.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- Is the risk assessment of the bell tower current enough to effectively ensure safety?
- How can the bell tower be most effectively apprised of relevant safeguarding information and changes, to ensure consistency across the cathedral?

3.3 CASE WORK (INCLUDING INFORMATION-SHARING)

3.3.1 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.

Effectiveness of responses

3.3.2 The auditors looked at five case files and found many of the cases were also discussed by those they spoke to during the site visit. These related to potentially vulnerable adults and children in contact with the cathedral.

3.3.3 Where incidents are reported, the reaction from the Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead is timely and effective and the auditors were struck by both the sensitivity of working and the extent to which close communication with the DSA is initiated and maintained. As per the SLA in place with the Diocese, this was both for cases of allegations and safeguarding concerns.

3.3.4 Where advice was sought from the DSA, timely referral to other statutory authorities was seen by the auditors and evidence of ongoing communication to ensure timely response and information-sharing with these bodies. The auditors were also struck by the effective use of formal Church mechanisms (such as Core Groups) to ensure that cases which were not satisfactorily progressing could be risk-managed.
3.3.5 The auditors recognised that, in addition to the appropriate safeguarding action being initiated, pastoral support was offered to the alleged victim and in some cases also to the alleged perpetrator, representing good practice.

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

3.3.6 The auditors saw several examples of safeguarding agreements and risk management plans. There was evidence of a process of review and monitoring to ensure that any agreements remained relevant and initiation of timely Core Groups where concerns persisted that could not effectively be managed by a safeguarding agreement.

3.3.7 In one example of a safeguarding agreement seen, however, there was no background information, which makes it difficult to establish, for anybody reviewing the file without this prior knowledge, to understand its context and the risks potentially posed.

Quality of recording

3.3.8 Case files were generally well presented and in chronological order. Files were comprehensive, including all communication pertaining to the case, which is helpful for ascertaining the progress of a case and actions taken.

3.3.9 Some files included a chronology sheet, logging the actions taken and their date which enables a clear understanding of the timeliness of actions and ensures that cases progress appropriately. In the majority of files, the outcome was clearly logged and there was evidence of actions taken to date in ongoing cases. This was not consistent across all files, but where it was included, it represents good practice.

3.3.10 Files generally contained the names of those to whom the case related, but this was not in a structured format with additional information (such as status of concern, role of subject etc.) such as a front sheet.

Information-sharing practice

3.3.11 Auditors saw a range of safeguarding concerns being noticed, recorded and shared across the cathedral generally. Concerns were reported directly to the Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, by email or by phone, or through the use of a concern report form.

3.3.12 In and around the Cathedral are clergy, the verger team, other staff and volunteers, all of whom may be contacted with potential safeguarding information. All were clear that they should pass on concerns promptly and generally cited the Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead as the first point of contact, with some also stating that they could talk to their line manager, the Dean, the DSA or CSO in their absence.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the cathedral best ensure a consistent approach to good practice in record-keeping within safeguarding files?
3.4 CLERGY DISCIPLINARY MEASURE

3.4.1 The auditors did not see any clergy disciplinary measure files as part of the audit.

3.5 TRAINING

3.5.1 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 of 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

3.5.2 Ensuring that all staff and volunteers are trained at a level commensurate with their post within the Cathedral context is a challenge. Wakefield uses the House of Bishops’ national training programme, but not uniformly. All clergy have received safeguarding for senior leaders (C4) training, in line with House of Bishops’ requirements.

3.5.3 There is a recognition that all staff and volunteers must undertake safeguarding training. This was described to the auditors as a work in progress at the Cathedral. All but one member of staff have completed at least C1 training. As previously described, the vast majority of volunteers have not undertaken the minimum basic (C0) safeguarding training.

3.5.4 Historically, under Heritage Lottery Funding, a paid Volunteer Manager was in post and attached to the community outreach team, but this was removed due to financial constraints and replaced three years ago with two Volunteer Coordinators. Unfortunately, one Volunteer Coordinator is unable to work at the current time, leaving the team understandably stretched. The current Volunteer Coordinator has a DBS check in place and is due to undertake leadership (C2) training in June 2020.

3.5.5 The Volunteer Coordinators see their role as ensuring safe recruitment and safeguarding training are in place for all new volunteers within the shop, café and welcome team only. Responsibility for volunteers in the bell tower and choir sits with the Tower Captain and Director of Music respectively.

3.5.6 For all staff, a new training database has been established by the COO to record training dates and levels. For volunteers, records are kept by the Volunteer Coordinator and are currently paper-based, with efforts being made to design an electronic database for use going forwards.

3.5.7 Auditors saw evidence that personnel files contain certificates of core safeguarding and other training undertaken by staff. Similarly, volunteer recruitment records held by the Volunteer Coordinator contain a record of completion of the Cathedral’s own induction training.
Analysis

3.5.8 The auditors judged that there is an understanding of the importance of training, and a general sense of willingness to engage with it. Despite this, there is a significant piece of work to engage with in the training of volunteers which has not been effectively addressed to date and remains a work in progress.

3.5.9 The Volunteer Coordinator, as part of efforts to strengthen volunteer recruitment, has done well to introduce induction procedures for new volunteers. These processes ensure that anybody new to the Cathedral is apprised of relevant information about it and its ethos, and is equipped with some core skills in supporting visitors as potentially vulnerable adults. This is supported by a process of shadowing with an experienced volunteer, an initial three-month review and ongoing annual reviews that enable the identification of ongoing needs and planning for support. This is well documented in volunteer recruitment files and reflects good practice.

3.5.10 There is a recognition that all staff and volunteers must undertake safeguarding training. This was described to the auditors as a work in progress at the Cathedral. As previously described, volunteer training has historically been poorly implemented due to what was described to auditors as a combination of capacity and financial constraints. Efforts have now begun to address this backlog.

3.5.11 The House of Bishops’ suite of safeguarding training is not currently in use for volunteers, who represent a large body of those in regular contact with children and potentially vulnerable adults. This needs to be used for all volunteers, alongside the bespoke training, together with a robust implementation plan that accounts for the support that some may need to best access it, as a priority. Senior leadership within the Cathedral should set a clear direction and expectation for this to strengthen compliance.

3.5.12 The current system of recording training for staff and volunteers, held separately by the COO and Volunteer Coordinator respectively, is not unified and this creates a risk that it is difficult to oversee, ensure and report accurately on to the Chapter. This is complicated further for volunteers working within the bell tower or choir, who are not within the remit of the Volunteer Coordinator and so not logged on their records.

3.5.13 In contrast to the good practice seen elsewhere in working between the Cathedral and Diocese, the DSA for Wakefield Cathedral has not been significantly involved by the Cathedral to date in supporting or providing some of the established training services that they offer. This is included in the SLA, which is well used elsewhere.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can senior leadership best embed a shared priority for the comprehensive and urgent delivery of safeguarding training for all those working within the Cathedral?
- How can the Cathedral best draw on the Diocese, or experience and practice of the other cathedrals within the Diocese, to inform and support its training
plan?
• Are current systems for recording training and training needs robust enough to ensure effective oversight?

3.6 SAFER RECRUITMENT

Description

3.6.1 The safe recruitment of staff falls within the remit of the COO. For volunteers, this is undertaken by the Volunteer Coordinator, in conjunction with the Canon Precentor as Chapter Safeguarding Lead. The auditors heard how all staff and volunteers complete an application form, have references and an interview/discussion. A confidential declaration is completed by those paid staff interacting with children and vulnerable adults, and all those in eligible roles are DBS checked.

3.6.2 DBS checks are recorded, and any blemished checks are passed to the DSA for a judgement as to whether the person can be safely brought into the Cathedral team.

3.6.3 Auditors reviewed six recruitment files of lay staff during the audit. These files generally reflected some good practice in safer recruitment, and retention of all pertinent records from the recruitment process. Some files contained evidence of job descriptions and person specifications, application forms (including a confidential declaration), interview letters and notes, two references and training records. However, this was not consistently applied, with most files missing some aspects of these records. None of the files seen contained a recruitment checklist.

3.6.4 The files seen showed a level of disorganisation, with recruitment checks and documents mixed with other human resource information, making the process of checking practices, at times, difficult.

3.6.5 The auditors reviewed a further four files of volunteer recruitment. These files reflected good organisation, with a recruitment checklist and date log, application forms (including confidential declaration where appropriate), interview notes, and evidence of references being taken. There was also evidence of induction processes, three-month review and annual review where applicable.

Analysis

3.6.6 The auditors judged there to be good practice evident in staff and volunteer recruitment alike, so reflecting a good understanding of what safe recruitment should look like. This is, however, not consistently documented in files.

3.6.7 The Volunteer Coordinator has made good efforts to conduct retrospective safer recruitment checks for existing volunteers, in line with changing national guidelines and requirements. Their approach to doing this and understanding of what is needed is rightly proportionate to strike a balance between ensuring that information is obtained where it can be while mindful of the practicalities of doing so where somebody has been employed by the Cathedral for an often extended period of time.
3.6.8 The auditors saw evidence that, despite good practice across both staff and volunteer files in safer recruitment, there is a lack of consistency across the two groups. A consistent approach to documenting recruitment checks is needed to ensure a standard experience for applicants and a safe workforce. Some disparities in checks being documented were evident. The auditors judged that this is, in part, complicated by the oversight for processes and record-keeping being held by two different individuals within the Cathedral.

3.6.9 Safer recruitment is the ‘front-door’ of safeguarding for new staff and volunteers and sets the tone of the Cathedral’s commitment. For those conducting safer recruitment of staff and volunteers, a good understanding of the legal frameworks and guidance is important to enable robust practices. The Volunteer Coordinator and COO have not undertaken safer recruitment training to date and this should be an area of priority.

3.6.10 Staff recruitment files reflected a level of disorganisation which meant, in practice, that safer recruitment checks were mixed with other recruitment and employment documentation. This raises several risks:

- difficulty tracking which checks have been completed and are outstanding, where records may be harder to find, especially in the absence of a recruitment checklist or robust recruitment recording system
- a likelihood that anybody auditing staff files for safeguarding is likely also to see other non-pertinent, confidential information. For example, payroll- and pensions-related documents, which challenges information security efforts.

**Questions for the Cathedral to consider**

- How can the cathedral ensure that consistency is assured across volunteer and staff recruitment files?
- Are core individuals involved in safer recruitment appropriately trained to support them in fulfilling this role?
4 FINDINGS – ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORTS

4.1 POLICY, PROCEDURES AND GUIDANCE

Description

4.1.1 Wakefield Cathedral has adopted the 2018 House of Bishops’ Parish Safeguarding Handbook as the overarching safeguarding policy for the cathedral. This is a generic policy for all parish churches and not, therefore, contextualised to the Cathedral. It has been supplemented by a cathedral Safeguarding Policy Statement which outlines the cathedral’s commitment. This is in addition to the House of Bishops’ own Promoting a Safer Church Safeguarding Policy Statement.

4.1.2 The Cathedral has also developed its own Safeguarding Privacy Notice, outlining the data potentially collected in ensuring safeguarding and the principles of how this data is protected.

4.1.3 There are currently no other specific policies related to safeguarding, for example whistleblowing, complaints or lone-working, though the auditors heard how plans are in place to develop some of them.

4.1.4 Wakefield Cathedral has a comprehensive risk register which is overseen by Chapter and covers aspects of safeguarding.

4.1.5 There are also various other Cathedral publications such as the Choristers’ and Parents’ Guide, Volunteer Induction Handbook and Lay Clerk and Choral Scholar Handbook, all with safeguarding sections. There is no safeguarding section in the Staff Handbook; principles of online safety are covered but with a greater focus on Cathedral reputation than the potential for harm.

4.1.6 None of the safeguarding policies or statements are included on the cathedral’s website, with the exception of the privacy statement which is available online, in addition to the details of safeguarding contacts and a link to the Diocesan safeguarding resources.

Analysis

4.1.7 The auditors recognise that this is an area of ongoing development that has seen much recent attention. The Cathedral has made steps to review and develop policy and ensure that staff are aware of it – involving Chapter in this process. However, gaps still exist.

4.1.8 The auditors judged that while the Parish Safeguarding Handbook is a comprehensive policy, it is not contextualised to the specific challenges faced by cathedrals in safeguarding. A specific, overarching Cathedral policy that is compliant with the House of Bishops’ guidelines would be relevant to those that work within and visit the Cathedral. This would allow it to be a ‘lived’ document that can respond to the changing environment of the Cathedral.

4.1.9 Although work has taken place to amend and update some handbooks for groups within the Cathedral, especially within the choir, there is a degree of inconsistency in the content, profile and tone taken in relation to safeguarding within them. This is both true of the Staff Handbook, where safeguarding does
not explicitly feature and issues that relate to safeguarding are addressed with a more reputational-risk focus, and of other areas where pertinent safeguarding information and contacts are out of date. This raises the risk that when individuals have cause to raise concern, they are unable to do so in the correct way.

4.1.10 The Canon Precentor, as Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, has identified areas where there are policy gaps, and has started the work on developing draft forms of policies to address them. For example, a complaints policy. However, policy-writing is a significant undertaking requiring time and capacity and requires an ongoing commitment to careful dissemination and monitoring. It is an endeavour that is most effective when it is shared – increasing the sense of ownership that eases implementation. Where this responsibility sits with one very stretched individual, it also raises the risk that this work becomes delayed.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the Cathedral ensure a wider ownership of policy development?
- How can it best be ensured that policy changes are rolled out across the Cathedral, its staff and volunteers?

4.2 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISER/CATHEDRAL SAFEGUARDING OFFICER

_Description_

4.2.1 As Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, the Canon Precentor takes responsibility for the majority of casework and safeguarding work within the cathedral, including liaison with the Diocese.

4.2.2 Wakefield has a CSO, a volunteer post which has been held by the current person for the past six years, coming from a background of employment in human resources outside of the Church. Initially, this role included the administration of safeguarding, including DBS and recruitment checks. The CSO reports to the Canon Precentor directly. They have a DBS check in place but have not attended any safeguarding training to date.

4.2.3 The CSO role in Wakefield has changed significantly in recent years with a reducing remit and involvement in day-to-day operational aspects and responsibility. There is currently no job description in place to outline what the responsibilities of this position currently are but it is recognised that there is potential for this role to become more central to safeguarding efforts at the Cathedral. The CSO sees their role as being the first port of call for those with concerns in safeguarding but acknowledges that the post is not used to its fullest at the current point, and is prepared to commit more time to it if needed. The auditors heard that the CSO role is recognised by some within the Cathedral staff and volunteer body, however not consistently named as a contact that would be approached if concerns were held in relation to safeguarding.

4.2.4 The Cathedral has a Children’s Advocate position which is fulfilled by a
volunteer with a background in nursing and adult social care. The Children’s Advocate was involved in writing the Cathedral’s safeguarding policy statement and in supporting children involved in a small number of recent concerns raised in relation to children. They have a DBS in place and have received foundation (C1) safeguarding training, though approximately five years ago. There is no job description to define their role in safeguarding.

4.2.5 The DSA has been in post for five years, and is from a background in local authority safeguarding. She has been the main DSA for Wakefield Cathedral since the summer of 2019. She works part-time for the Diocese and cover is provided by the two other DSAs, who collectively serve Wakefield, Bradford and Rippon Cathedrals.

4.2.6 The auditors heard and saw evidence of the effectiveness of this relationship and communication between the Cathedral and DSAs, which is supported by the SLA.

4.2.7 The DSA team is supported by the Diocesan Secretary, which is a significant role in safeguarding in relation to cathedrals within the Leeds Diocese. They provide supervision to the DSAs on allegations management to ensure that cases progress within cathedrals and provide a ‘lessons learned’ meeting to review learning points from cases, to which all three Deans are invited.

Analysis

4.2.8 The auditors judged that there is excellent co-working between the Diocese, the DSA(s) and the Cathedral and that this is an area of real strength. This is supported by the very active involvement of the Diocesan Secretary and underpinned by the SLA. The auditors saw evidence of the impact of this in the safeguarding efforts within the Cathedral.

4.2.9 The current arrangements within the cathedral of the Canon Precentor taking both the core operational role in safeguarding while also leading strategic efforts for its development is, in the auditors’ judgement, a position that is difficult to sustain. Safe systems are built on shared ownership of safeguarding and distributed leadership that allows for both the capacity and expertise held by a range of individuals to be brought to bear, and at different levels of the Cathedral’s structure.

4.2.10 The roles of the CSO and the Children’s Advocate are currently underutilised within the Cathedral. The lack of defined job role, clearly communicated to those that work within and use the Cathedral, means that in practice few people the auditors spoke with recognised these individuals as potential contacts to seek advice from and raise concerns with. More people in safeguarding leadership roles creates more points of contact for raising such concerns and ensures that safeguarding is ‘owned’ at every level. There is significant potential for developing this within the cathedral, particularly given the commitment of the volunteers currently holding these positions.

4.2.11 The current CSO does not have any safeguarding training and this is now a priority to put in place to support their role going forward, and ensure that they are equipped to support the safeguarding efforts of the cathedral and take a central role in the operational leadership of this.

4.2.12 The DSA team within the diocese of Leeds have a good understanding of the
Cathedral context and work closely on issues of allegations management and safeguarding case work. This helps to achieve the level of consistency and quality seen in the day-to-day safeguarding work of the Cathedral. This is helped by the established relationships between key individuals, open dialogue and accessibility of DSA support wherever it is needed.

4.2.13 In the undertaking of developing broader safeguarding structures within the Cathedral, this established working relationship with the DSA team and with the two other cathedrals within the diocese provides a good opportunity for learning and sharing of practice to support these efforts.

**Questions for the Cathedral to consider**

- How can the Cathedral better utilise the existing safeguarding positions of the CSO and Children’s Advocate in a distributed leadership structure, using the experience of the Diocese and other cathedrals for support?

### 4.3 RECORDING AND IT SYSTEMS

4.3.1 The Cathedral does not have an electronic database for case management and files, and records are paper-based. The auditors saw evidence that this is working effectively at present, given the relatively small number of cases held (see 3.3).

4.3.2 To track training and DBS checks, the COO has an electronic record in place for clergy and lay staff, albeit in the early stages, for the recording of training, which is incomplete at present. The Volunteer Coordinator has a paper-based system in place for volunteers, and is in the process of designing an electronic record for capturing this information going forwards.

4.3.3 The Cathedral is in the process of introducing the ‘ChurchSuite’ system for integrating communication and planning, including with the choir and choir parents. This will provide a platform for parents to be able to update information on choristers and make the process of group communications more efficient. It is hoped that this will also bring an easier process of management of chaperone rotas.

**Questions for the Cathedral to consider**

- There were no considerations raised under this heading.
5 FINDINGS – LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY

5.1 QUALITY ASSURANCE

5.1.1 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.

5.1.2 Wakefield Cathedral has a comprehensive risk register which is useful in supporting quality assurance by red, amber or green-rating risk in a wide range of areas. This is regularly scrutinised by Chapter.

5.1.3 Chapter receives a verbal safeguarding report from the Canon Precentor, as Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, at each meeting, and there is challenge and support provided, including on new policies related to safeguarding, of which there are several pending approval. The auditors heard how efforts of the current Dean have been focused on ensuring that Chapter provides a robust level of scrutiny and there is a feeling that this now works well.

5.1.4 Because the Cathedral does not yet have a working, independently chaired CSAP, or a direct representative on the DSAP, there is not yet the measure of scrutiny of the safeguarding work in the Cathedral that there could be. Once this is in place, real consideration of quality assurance loops and how the three systems (DSAP, Chapter and CSAP) will link together, particularly delineating the operational and strategic quality assurance of safeguarding, should be put in place.

5.1.5 The auditors saw no evidence of formal internal audit or action planning, albeit they did see evidence that the Canon Precentor has a clear set of priorities for the future operational and strategic development of safeguarding.

5.1.6 Despite the current lack of structures to support safeguarding quality assurance, the auditors did see genuine efforts to learn from any recent problems which have arisen across the Cathedral. This was evident in the amendments made to procedures and processes and to the handbooks provided, especially the Choristers’ and Parents’ Guide and Lay Clerk and Choral Scholar Handbook.

Analysis

5.1.7 The auditors judged that, while Chapter are playing an important role in the strategic and quality assurance efforts of safeguarding, there is potential for greater independence to be introduced at an operational level.

5.1.8 The Chapter at Wakefield Cathedral has evolved into a very robust and useful body for assuring the quality of safeguarding, and this is reflected by the regular consideration of safeguarding in their meetings and the evidence seen of them holding to account and providing challenge and scrutiny.
5.1.9 Although safeguarding appears as a standing item, Chapter does not currently receive reports on the wider aspects of safeguarding, including on issues relating to human resources, recruitment checks and training. This means that it is not always provided with the information to be able to provide this level of scrutiny and challenge in these areas.

5.1.10 The close working with the Diocese, and other cathedrals within the diocese, also contributes an important aspect of quality assurance for Wakefield Cathedral. It provides the opportunity for several ‘critical friends’ to share practice, and this is a resource that is not necessarily common in other dioceses, given the unique structure of Leeds.

5.1.11 Because there is no working CSAP, there isn’t currently the measure of scrutiny that there could be, particularly at the operational level. This is especially true where there is no independent chairing or membership of such operational groups who can bring outside expertise and challenge, as well as support.

5.1.12 A CSAP also presents an important opportunity in helping to delineate the operational and strategic areas of safeguarding, allowing Chapter to hold the strategic quality assurance focus. However, despite not currently having this at Wakefield Cathedral, there have been real efforts to implement changes to policy and procedure as a result of learning generated from cases, ultimately improving safeguarding practice.

5.1.13 The auditors saw evidence of an audit checklist which identified the development needs and some core areas of activity to develop safeguarding. However, this was not contemporary and was last completed in 2015. It was unclear to auditors how this was being used as part of current efforts of quality assurance and to build a dynamic action plan that is able to respond to the changing needs of the Cathedral.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the Cathedral best introduce a level of operational quality assurance, including a degree of independent scrutiny?
- How can the Cathedral better use strategic and operational quality assurance mechanisms to hold shared account in safeguarding, such as through action planning?

5.2 COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE SAFEGUARDING SERVICE

5.2.1 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.

5.2.2 Wakefield Cathedral does not currently have a complaints policy in place, though a draft version has been developed and is pending Chapter approval. It was therefore not seen by the auditors.
Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the cathedral ensure that a complaints policy is in place and disseminated effectively to staff, volunteers and visitors to the Cathedral?

5.3 WHISTLEBLOWING

5.3.1 The Cathedral does not have a whistleblowing policy in place. This is an important aspect of assuring a strong safeguarding culture.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the Cathedral ensure that a whistleblowing policy is in place and disseminated effectively to staff and volunteers?

5.4 SAFEGUARDING ADVISORY PANEL

5.4.1 Based on the national guidance in Roles and Responsibilities for 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. No specifics are provided in relation to cathedrals, with the apparent assumption being that cathedrals are part of Diocesan structures.

Description

5.4.2 No one from Wakefield Cathedral currently sits on the Leeds DSAP. The three cathedrals in the Diocese are represented together by the Dean of Bradford. The cathedrals not in attendance do not receive the minutes of this meeting.

5.4.3 The DSAP, while a helpful forum for the strategic governance of safeguarding, is currently compromised by the challenge in securing consistent external representatives which the auditors heard limits the effectiveness of continuity and the ability to establish working relationships.

5.4.4 Currently, the Cathedral does not have a working CSAP.

Analysis

5.4.5 The effective links with the Diocese create both a valuable opportunity for the strategic governance of safeguarding, and a forum at which the Cathedral could be more directly represented, going forward.

5.4.6 The sharing of information between the Cathedral and Diocese, and vice versa, is important in enabling close working and learning. The auditors heard of plans to begin sharing minutes from the DSAP meetings with the Cathedral, and in turn for the Cathedral to share minutes of Chapter safeguarding discussions with the Diocese. The auditors judged this to be a potentially beneficial arrangement for both parties involved, and it that would further ensure coordinated learning and quality assurance.
Questions for the Cathedral to consider
- How can it be ensured that the DSAP, as a key asset in the governance of safeguarding, is best utilised?

5.5 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

5.5.1 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

5.5.2 As the leader of every aspect of the Cathedral’s life, the Dean of Wakefield has overall theological responsibility for promoting safeguarding. The current Dean has a vision for the Cathedral as being a welcoming, listening, supportive environment.

5.5.3 The theology of safeguarding cuts across all of these objectives and involves the Cathedral ensuring that safeguarding is embedded in all that it does, including recognising it in teaching, worship and prayer. The Dean has tackled this more implicitly to date and not preached specifically on safeguarding. However, the auditors heard how he aims to do this wherever possible and the theological approach taken is liberal and affirming and so reflective of the culture of openness and tolerance. Issues of social justice are tackled more explicitly and a particular area of importance is considered by the Dean to be tolerance and acceptance of sexuality and sexual identity.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider
- There were no considerations raised under this heading.

Strategic leadership

Description

5.5.4 The House of Bishops’ Roles and Responsibilities practice guidance assigns different and overlapping roles to Dean and Chapter, with the former having a clear leadership role in relation to safeguarding, and Chapter having a strategic and oversight role in relation to the CofE’s Promoting a Safer Church safeguarding policy. This includes the requirement to have a Promoting a Safer Church action plan in place that sets out, in line with national and local priorities, how the policy is being put into action, and is reviewed regularly.

5.5.5 The Chapter of Wakefield Cathedral usually consists of 11 members. Five of these are clergy, including the Dean, three are Residentiary Canons and a member of the College of Canons. There are also five executive lay members. Currently, there is one Residentiary Canon and one lay member vacancy,
reducing this number to nine. The Canon Precentor, as Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, attends each meeting and provides a report on safeguarding.

5.5.6 The Dean takes his role in safeguarding very seriously. Prior to joining Wakefield Cathedral, he held senior clergy roles with safeguarding responsibility and previously oversaw the introduction of CRB checks in the Diocese along with the Diocesan Secretary. On appointment at Wakefield in September 2018 he was clear on the safeguarding priorities of the Cathedral and his role in achieving change. Due to the current capacity issues at the Cathedral, the Dean takes an active role in supporting the Canon Precentor to fulfil her role and maintains close, near-daily communication.

5.5.7 Due to the structure of Leeds as a unitary Diocese, scrutiny of the extent to which Chapter are able to achieve this is difficult to assure, with no current ‘feeding-up’ from the Cathedral to the DSAP or ‘feeding-down’ from the DSAP to the Cathedral, via a Cathedral representative.

Analysis

5.5.8 The auditors judged that the strategic leadership of safeguarding within the Cathedral is good. There has been, and continues to be, a clear understanding of where development is needed and a vision for achieving this.

5.5.9 The auditors heard a uniform message, through conversations with all those they met, that the Dean has a very clear and visible commitment to promoting safeguarding and introducing changes where needed in a number of areas. With the support of the Canon Precentor as Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, much change has been driven within a relatively short space of time and with a recently reduced capacity of senior clergy (as described above in 2.3.2).

5.5.10 This rapid change has, at times, been difficult to adapt to, especially where operational, attitudinal and practice shifts were needed to accommodate it. This is perhaps especially true within the choir, where the auditors heard how much change has been introduced but not always with a full consideration of the operational supports needed to enable it. Consideration must be given to bringing all those working within the Cathedral along on the journey of safeguarding improvement, to ensure that any changes are well embedded into practice.

5.5.11 As with some other cathedrals, there is a blurring of function between strategic and operational leadership, with the clergy members of Chapter providing both the strategic direction and oversight of the delivery of safeguarding efforts. This is particularly the case at Wakefield Cathedral where there is no established CSAP or CSO role remit to support the operational aspects, which would enable a clearer delineation and opportunity for ongoing monitoring and implementation support.
Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the Cathedral enable Chapter to maintain a strategic focus on safeguarding?
- Is there a role for an operational forum, with membership from the different departments, in supporting implementation and change management in safeguarding?

Operational leadership and management

Description

5.5.12 With a lack of a defined role for the CSO, the pivotal role in safeguarding is with senior clergy. In practice this is the Canon Precentor as Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead, in the absence of a Canon for Congregational Development. On appointment, the role of Chapter Safeguarding Lead will sit with this post.

5.5.13 The Canon Precentor has been in post since 2016, assuming increasing responsibility for safeguarding across the Cathedral over this period and becoming the Acting Chapter Safeguarding Lead in September 2019. This is supported by her experience as a safeguarding governor in schools, both historic and current. She is widely recognised by most that the auditors spoke to as the first port of call for safeguarding concerns within the Cathedral.

5.5.14 To the auditors, it was clear that the CSO, while generally well recognised in and about the Cathedral, does not play a central role in operational safeguarding leadership. In practice, several individuals provide a degree of operational leadership (i.e. Volunteer Coordinator, Director of Music and Community Outreach Officer) and feed directly into the Dean’s leadership team as their line managers, without any other layer or operational conduit for safeguarding support.

5.5.15 The COO sits on the Dean’s leadership team, as does the Canon Precentor. Safeguarding therefore appears well represented, and the auditors heard that safeguarding is a regular part of the agenda. However, it could not be established what the extent of the decisions made here are.

5.5.16 There are monthly meetings for Cathedral staff at which the Canon Precentor can provide updates and raise concerns about safeguarding practice for dissemination to wider staff. Until recently, volunteers had separate termly update meetings, but these have paused with the reduction of capacity caused by the Residentiary Canon vacancy. Therefore, it was unclear how pertinent safeguarding information is reliably shared with volunteers in the absence of this forum.

5.5.17 The Diocese of Leeds also has a College of Canons which meets annually. The Canons of Wakefield Cathedral also meet twice a year, separate to the whole college meeting, and so support the Cathedral by advising on their priorities for the year ahead, playing a part in its governance.
Analysis

5.5.18 The auditors judged that the operational leadership of safeguarding at the Cathedral is good, and has achieved some stability with the current Canon Precentor. However, there remains scope to distribute operational leadership further to safeguard capacity and future impact.

5.5.19 The auditors heard, from the majority of those spoken to, of the positive impact of the Canon Precentor in assuming responsibility for safeguarding. This was initially within the music department and, since September 2019, across the wider Cathedral.

5.5.20 The close working between the Dean and Canon Precentor is evident and positive, and the outward-facing approach taken has improved links with other bodies such as local schools. For example, the Canon Precentor’s role as a governor at a local school enables closer communication and relationships to be built, particularly as this school is attended by a large number of current choristers.

5.5.21 The auditors again recognise, however, the challenge of wearing both a strategic and operational ‘hat’ in safeguarding and the inherent risk where a small number of individuals hold responsibility for safeguarding. This is perhaps especially relevant at the Cathedral as there are plans for further changes to the operational leadership of safeguarding upon appointment of the new Canon for Congregational Development, who will assume this role. Careful succession planning is important to ensure that safeguarding improvement efforts continue and become an increasingly shared endeavour.

Questions for the Cathedral to consider

- How can the Cathedral ensure that the operational leadership of safeguarding is shared more widely with those with key safeguarding roles?
- How might the Cathedral best plan for succession of the operational leadership role?

Culture

5.5.22 The most critical aspect of safeguarding relates to the culture within any organisation. In a CofE 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. SCIE’s experience auditing safeguarding in faith contexts more broadly, suggests that in areas where there is experience among senior clergy of previous serious abuse cases, a culture of openness and humility in approaching safeguarding issues can be stronger and accompanied by a move away from responses which give too much attention to reputational issues and the welfare of (alleged) perpetrators, as opposed to the welfare of victims and survivors.

5.5.23 Any cathedral should strive for an open, learning culture where safeguarding is a shared responsibility, albeit supported by experts, and which encourages people to raise concerns about how things are working in order that they can be addressed. An open learning culture starts from the assumption that
maintaining adequate vigilance is difficult and proactively seeks feedback on how safeguarding is operating and encourages people to highlight any concerns.

5.5.24 In Wakefield’s self-assessment prior to audit, it was noted that safeguarding is a priority in all that is done within the Cathedral. The auditors heard and saw evidence of this and of the extent to which safeguarding culture has improved within the Cathedral since the arrival of the current Dean and Canon Precentor, with it now being high on the agenda of individuals, ranging from volunteers to executive staff.

5.5.25 The auditors heard and saw evidence of the range of procedures and changes that have been implemented since the assumption of the safeguarding remit by the Canon Precentor. This includes procedures for chorister handover and supervision.

5.5.26 There was a tangible lack of complacency about the need for continued improvement at the Cathedral to ensure that the culture is safe. The Cathedral’s self-assessment, for example, highlighted the work still to be done in assuring that the needs of vulnerable adults across the wider Cathedral community are recognised. Much of what might support the Cathedral in achieving this is discussed in previous sections.

5.5.27 Despite this commonly-held view of safeguarding as a priority in the Cathedral, it was not reflected in the material and ‘publicity’ of safeguarding around the buildings and site. The auditors noted use of ‘Promoting a Safer Church’ posters, containing names and contact details of key people, but not significantly visible and not, for example, receiving the same profile afforded through display boards detailing key staff roles and photographs or community outreach events. The auditors heard that, in the opinion of some, this lack of advertising is impacting on the visibility and maximisation of key safeguarding roles, especially the CSO and Children’s Advocate.

Analysis

5.5.28 The auditors judged that, while there is a strong understanding of safeguarding as both a priority and core purpose in all that the Cathedral does, and across all levels within the Cathedral, there is scope to better publicise safeguarding to visitors and those that use the Cathedral.

5.5.29 The auditors were struck by the extent to which volunteers and the verger team recognise the importance of safeguarding and inclusivity in the course of their work within the Cathedral and, in several examples, go above and beyond in supporting those with vulnerabilities. In one example that the auditors heard of, this included contacting local and national bodies to help a visitor to the Cathedral who was homeless to access support and accommodation.

5.5.30 Despite the Cathedral’s commitment to safeguarding that was evident among those spoken to, the auditors felt that this was not reflected in the profile of safeguarding in written materials and publications on display around the site. This includes both the profile of publicity on core safeguarding contacts and safeguarding promotion materials on pertinent topics, for example domestic violence. Similarly, within certain Cathedral documents, such as handbooks,
there was a degree of inconsistency noted in the tone taken in relation to safeguarding.

**Questions for the Cathedral to consider**

- How can it be ensured that the profile of the Cathedral's commitment to safeguarding is reflected to those that use the site?
6 CONCLUSIONS

This section provides the headline findings from the audit, drawing out positives and the areas for improvement. The detail behind these appraisals is in the main body of the report.

6.1.1 There is a strong understanding of safeguarding as both a priority and core purpose in all that the Cathedral does, and across all levels within the Cathedral.

6.1.2 The well-resourced verger team are effective in their arrangements for the safety and security of the site, as well as all those working in and visiting the Cathedral.

6.1.3 The provision for vulnerable adults is an area of real strength in the Cathedral and there are visible efforts to make the cathedral an inclusive and welcoming place to all.

6.1.4 There is a wide range of safely managed outreach provision for children, especially given the context of the resources available to the Cathedral.

6.1.5 There are many positives about the choir, the music department, its leadership and impact. There have been a number of changes and improvements for the safety of children which are appreciated by all. Nonetheless, there are also a number of areas where improvements need to be made.

6.1.6 The Cathedral benefits from a remarkably experienced and committed Acting Tower Captain and team, and their close relationship with the Cathedral.

6.1.7 There is an understanding of the importance of training, and a general sense of willingness to engage with it. Despite this there is a significant piece of work to engage with in the training of volunteers which has not been effectively addressed to date and remains a work in progress.

6.1.8 There is good practice evident in staff and volunteer recruitment alike, so reflecting a good understanding of what safe recruitment should look like, albeit not consistently documented in files.

6.1.9 Policy and procedures are an area of ongoing development that has seen much recent attention. The Cathedral has taken steps to review and develop policy and ensure that staff are aware of this, involving Chapter in the process. However, gaps still exist.

6.1.10 There is excellent co-working between the diocese, the DSA(s) and the Cathedral and this is an area of real strength. It is supported by the very active involvement of the Diocesan Secretary, underpinned by the SLA. The auditors saw evidence of the impact of this in the safeguarding efforts within the Cathedral.

6.1.11 While Chapter is playing an important role in the strategic and quality assurance efforts of safeguarding, there is potential for greater independence to be introduced at an operational level.
6.1.12 The effective links with the Diocese create both a valuable opportunity for the strategic governance of safeguarding, and a forum at which the Cathedral could be more directly represented, going forward.

6.1.13 The strategic leadership of safeguarding within the Cathedral is good. There has been, and continues to be, a clear understanding of where development is needed and a vision for achieving this.

6.1.14 The operational leadership of safeguarding at the Cathedral is good, and has achieved some stability with the current Canon Precentor. However, there remains scope to distribute operational leadership further to safeguard both capacity and future impact.

6.1.15 While there is a strong understanding of safeguarding as both a priority and core purpose in all that the Cathedral does, and across all levels within the Cathedral, there is scope to better publicise safeguarding to visitors and those that use the Cathedral.
APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS

DATA COLLECTION

Information provided to auditors

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

- Annual Report of the Chapter for Year Ended December 2018 (June 2019)
  Cathedral Café Risk Assessment (September 2018)
  Cathedral Risk Register (December 2019)
- Safeguarding Checklist (October 2015)
  Cathedral Safeguarding Policy Statement (November 2019)
  ‘Promoting a Safer Church’ poster (October 2019)
  Promoting a Safer Church Statement (2017)
  Cathedral Safeguarding Privacy Notice (2020)
  Chapter Minutes (October 2019)
- Chapter Minutes (November 2019)
- Chapter Minutes (December 2019)
- Diocese Partnership Arrangement (October 2019)
  Risk Assessment: Education Leaver’s Service (2018)
- Risk Assessment: Education General (2016)
- Risk Assessment: Education Chantry Chapel (2016)
- Risk Assessment: Education Leavers’ Service (2019)
- Staff Handbook (2019)
- Volunteer Induction Book (November 2019)
- Wakefield Cathedral organisation chart (January 2020)
- Cathedral description (January 2020)
- Cathedral overview (January 2020)
- Safeguarding concern report form (2017)
- Safeguarding recording template (Adopted November 2019)
- Safeguarding Register (November 2019)
- Safeguarding Training Log (January 2020)
- SCIE Briefing Pack (September 2018)
- SCIE Focus Group: Choristers – Invite Letter (January 2020)
- SCIE Focus Group: Parents – Invite Letter (January 2020)
- SCIE Focus Group: Volunteers – Invite Letter (January 2020)
- Audit Timetable (January 2020)
- Safeguarding Self-Assessments (January 2020)
- Music Department Safeguarding and Health and Safety Risk Assessment (January 2020)
• Letter from Wakefield LADO (January 2020)
• Volunteer induction presentation (undated)

Participation of members of the Cathedral and Diocese

The auditors had conversations with:
• The Dean
• The Canon Precentor
• The Cathedral Safeguarding Officer
• The Community Outreach Officer
• The Acting Tower Captain
• The Diocesan Secretary
• The Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor
• The Head Verger
• The Chief Operating Officer
• The Director of Music
• The Children’s Advocate
• The Volunteer Coordinator

Focus groups were held with:
• Choristers
• Chorister parents
• Volunteers

What records/files were examined?
• Staff recruitment files
• Volunteer recruitment files
• Safeguarding case files