

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

CKC

1. My name is CKC. My date of birth is 1952. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Background

2. Prior to going into teaching I served for five years with the Royal Marines. I attended university and obtained a BA Hons in and I have my PGCE (Post Graduate Certificate in Education). In 1983 I began teaching at High School and remained there for four years. From 1987 until 1991 I moved to High School where I was SNR. From I moved to Academy where again I was SNR and remained there until 1994. That year I took on the role of SNR at Academy and was there for three years. From 1997 until 2012 I taught at Queen Victoria School.

Employment with Queen Victoria School

3. I began working at Queen Victoria School in 1997 and remained there until 2012. I was appointed as SNR at the school but this title was later changed to SNR when SNR posts were rebranded to SNR SNR.
4. At Queen Victoria I was responsible for which included school planning, Curriculum, timetabling, Exam Board for Internal Exams, prize giving and supply staff.

5. I applied for the position via an advert in the Times Education Supplement. I was then called for interviews which took place over two days. Those interviews included formal and informal sessions as well as psychometric testing. The school also took up my references. I had my registration with GTCS (General Teaching Council for Scotland) and this was a prerequisite for the position, along with a one year probationary period.
6. There were two headmasters that I reported to during my time at the school. From 1997 until 2008 that was Brian Raine. From 2008 until I left in 2012 it was Wendy Bellars. A great deal of the day to day liaison took place as well as management meetings. I would also meet with the Head in my every morning before assembly. Any monitoring was carried out via the MoD appraisal system.
7. Training was always made available to all staff, based on the need of the school, staff and pupils. My training was largely based around the various curriculum changes at the time as well as computerised timetabling and school management systems which I introduced. The school took advantage of both the Independent Schools and the State Schools In-service programmes.

Policy

8. Child Protection/Pastoral Policies within the school were the remit of the Deputy Head (Pastoral). Those policies were drawn up between the Pastoral Head and the Head Teacher. It would have been discussed at management team meetings before being issued.
9. Policies were always changing to reflect both internal and external pressures. This was usually the Care Commission in the form of National Guidelines. Examples of this were satisfaction surveys which were completed by pupils and parents via the Care Commission. The HMI surveyed parents as part of their inspections. The school did so as part of Investors in People and they were carried out for the Care Commission after 2006/7. The returns were sent out by the school and returned to the school. They were collated by Deputy Head (Pastoral). I don't have an exact figure but I do remember it being quite high with favourable responses. The exact figures are probably still available.

10. Other recommendations from the Care Commission such as increases in staff to pupil ratios in the boarding houses were taken up. Further amendments may have been made after the pupil/parent satisfaction surveys or from HMIE (Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education), Investors in People, SCE (Service Children's Education) or from Internal recommendations. The results of the surveys were consistently favourable, but the Deputy Head (Pastoral) would focus on any low scoring areas, for his action plan.

Strategic planning

11. The school adopted as far as it could the state school system of planning, i.e. using How Good Is Our School (HGIOS). I would issue and collate the HGIOS Self Evaluation sheets to staff. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] We would then use the results of the HGIOS evaluations to frame our school development planning. The potential for abuse would have appeared in the Pastoral sections of HGIOS which were completed by staff, pupils and parents.
12. The approach to planning when I joined was rudimentary, as it was in many state schools. When HGIOS was introduced the staff and management team spent a lot of time on HGIOS and planning. Our school planning was over a three year rolling cycle. Later on when we became more under the umbrella of the Service Children's Education (SCE) we also incorporated some of their planning techniques. At one stage, it could be said we were doing too much planning. However, the strength of the HGIOS evaluations was that they covered all areas of the school and were completed by staff, pupils and parents, which meant that we could pinpoint weaknesses.

Other staff

13. Initially I was responsible for all the [REDACTED] staff. This was later changed to just the SNR [REDACTED] (I think this was to put us in line with SCE). I was responsible for monitoring their performance in the classroom, exam results and general running of

the departments. I was also responsible for carrying out appraisals for School secretary and, for a time the Pipe Band staff.

Recruitment of staff

14. I did have some responsibility for the recruitment of the teaching staff. The recruitment procedures were dealt with by the HR Department and followed, to the letter, the MoD procedures for recruitment of staff. All paperwork was issued and collated by the HR Manager and the school Bursar (A career MoD employee) sat on the panels to ensure procedures were followed. For academic posts we could co-opt a Principal Teacher from one of the Stirling Schools onto the interview panel to gain their insight and experience.
15. References were called for, for the short leet interviewees. The reference as far as I can remember was based on the criteria set out on the job description.
16. I don't know if the referees were always spoken to. There were times when we did ask HR to clarify points on reference. For any successful candidate references were always taken up.

Training of staff

17. I was responsible for the training of staff. I held the training budget so all requests for training came through me. Training was rarely refused as long as it could be shown it would meet the needs of one or all of the categories, i.e. School, Staff, Pupils. Examples could be First Aid Training D of E, bereavement counselling, sports coaching, along with the gamut of courses which would enhance the skills of the teacher in the classroom.
18. Courses would also reflect the National Priorities for education and the Care Commission National Guidelines. Requests would also come through the Deputy

Head (Pastoral) re courses which he wanted his pastoral staff to do. Up to about 2001/2 this would have been Alice Hainey, then from 2002/2006? Lynn Smith and from 2006-2012. Graham Carroll. The school development planning system was trying to coordinate this through the need brought out by HGIOS evaluation.

Supervision/staff appraisal / staff evaluation

19. I did have some involvement in the supervision, completion of appraisals and the evaluation of teaching staff.
20. For the non-teaching staff. i.e. Pipe Band, school secretary, the system that we used was the MoD appraisal system used for all MoD employees. For the Principal Teachers the system was evolving and was a mixture of the MoD system, the State system, that used by SCE and refinements from the school itself. It was based on targets and development needs and took place each year. Before I left, the system had changed to each of the SMT (Senior Management Team) being responsible for a group of Principal Teachers in loose faculty groupings.

Living arrangements

21. I lived in a school house which was situated [REDACTED] Other staff lived throughout the school campus, mainly in a housing area at one end of the school grounds. Other staff i.e. the House Staff, Housemaster/Mistress, their deputies, house matrons, all lived in the boarding houses. Other staff lived in their own houses in the local area. At one time all the teaching staff had to live on campus but a shortage of housing meant that the policy was changed.
22. With regard to access to the children's residential areas all staff who worked in the boarding house would have access to these areas but the house staff had their own entrance which they tended to use. Access to the boarding house was via a locked door with a coded key pad.

Culture within Royal Victoria School

23. Even during my time the culture within the school changed. It had only recently started to take in girls when I arrived and the school was very male dominated. The Pipe Band, rugby and the CCF were seen as the important areas, even to the extent of inclusion in the timetable.
24. Timetabling time was taken from these areas and given over to PSE (Personal Social and Health Education). Over time and as new staff and more female staff were employed the emphasis did change more to academic.
25. In the time I was there the culture changed very much to pupil centred one. Speaking to parents they told me the reason they sent their child to the school was to get a good all-round education and to take advantage of all there was to offer in the Scottish tradition. Our exam results were consistently higher than the Scottish State School average.
26. By the time I left the school the culture was not much different from the average state school and in many ways i.e. general behaviour and manners were better. My experience was that the children enjoyed their time at the school, they felt safe and they made good friends.
27. To my knowledge fagging did not exist in the school.

Discipline and punishment

28. The usual types of punishments ranging from punishment exercises, detention, loss of privileges to gating, loss of weekend pass, suspension were used. Teaching staff were allowed to use the lesser punishments and could only recommend the higher. The higher punishments were reserved for management staff. House Masters/Mistresses would be the same as for teaching staff although

Housemaster/Mistress tended to have more sway in matters relating to the Boarding Houses.

29. At the school we did have a Policy on discipline and this was communicated to staff through meetings/inset sessions in the school. The policy was communicated to the pupils via formal PSE classes and Tutor Group meetings. Each teacher was responsible for a small group of pupils, normally between eight and ten. They would meet once a week and discuss matters put forward by the SMT or more usually the Deputy Head (Pastoral). The pupils were able to put their views forward at these meetings. The Tutors would also take them out on outings, cinema, bowling etc. as well as write reports on their progress. The tutor was the first port of call re concerns about a pupil.
30. The discipline policy was meant to be followed consistently at all times for all pupils. In practice some discretion was used at certain times, e.g. deployments to active service, marital problems etc. Records were kept on the school management system. The Head would have a record of serious incidents.
31. Senior Prefects could give out "days", which meant that pupils would help clear the dining hall. The list was checked by "duty" teaching staff. I think that this may have changed later to recommendations for punishments, rather than actual punishments. I think this was a recommendation after the introduction of the Care Commission in 2006?.

Day to day running of the school

32. I was involved in the day to day running of the school. There was always a member of the SMT on call during the week and the weekends. They were available to all staff, pupils and parents for any concerns. In the evenings they would do a tour of the boarding houses to chat to staff and pupils, supervise homework, be available for fire alarms or any other emergencies at the school.

33. Each member of staff worked one evening a week in the House and two weekends a term. They worked alongside the Housemaster/Mistress or their Deputy during the busy times of the day. (Prep times and meal times) They were assisted by a GAP student. The Matron was also in the House. In addition the Housemaster/Deputy had to be in the House and available if required.
34. At the weekend there was a teacher and a GAP student with a Matron and a Housemaster available. Weekends were usually very quiet as many pupils went on pass, were away playing sport or out on Tutor trips.
35. I do feel confident that had there been any abuse then that would have come to light.
36. The message in the school was that pupils should always report things that they were not happy about, either about themselves or other pupils. This message was consistently pushed through PSE classes, Tutor Group meetings and House meetings. The pupils were very good at looking out for each other. There were always two teachers, a matron and a GAP student in the house.

Concerns about the school

37. I am not aware that the school was the subject of concern, in school or to any external agency, or to any other person, because of the way in which children and young people in the school were treated.

Reporting of complaints/concerns

38. If any child in the school, or another person on their behalf, wished to make a complaint or report a concern, there were processes in place to deal with this.

39. The complaints procedure echoed that of the MoD. Parents, staff, pupils could write to the Head and he had an obligation to follow it through. There were very few official complaints made during my time at the school. Pupils, staff and parents tended to follow more informal channels, e.g. face to face or by telephone.
40. All official complaints were kept in the Head Teacher's office, HR Files or in the Boarding House logs.

Trusted adult/confidante

41. The pupils were encouraged to find another person they trusted, if they didn't want to go through the tutor system. This could include the House Master/Mistress, House Matron, School Chaplain or the School Nurse.
42. Over time the introduction of the tutor system proved to be beneficial and tutors did report things on as did other staff.

Abuse

43. During my time at the school there was a definition of "abuse" that would be applied to the treatment of children at the school. Abuse could be sexual, mental, physical or neglect and anything which would prevent the child from thriving.
44. During In-service days at the beginning of terms there was always a slot for Child Protection and for Health and Safety. This would be led by the Deputy Head (Pastoral) or an outside agency. It was discussed at Boarding House team meetings. As regards to the pupils this was covered in the PSE programme and Tutor group meetings.

45. The Child Protection Policy was introduced around 1994 when the school appointed a pastoral deputy. The policy evolved over time with each different pastoral deputy and with the emergence of the Care Commission and the National Guidelines.

Child protection arrangements

46. Guidance and instruction on how children in the care of the school should be treated, cared for and protected against abuse, ill treatment or inappropriate behaviour was covered during In-service sessions at the beginning of each term. This started with teaching staff and was later expanded to all staff. This move was greatly valued by the non-teaching staff.
47. The policy gave instruction on how to handle, and respond to, reports of abuse or ill-treatment or inappropriate behaviour. The general instruction to staff was to ensure the child was safe and then to pass the matter to the relevant management team member, almost always the Deputy Head (Pastoral). The Pastoral Deputy would follow a similar procedure, i.e. inform the relevant agencies (Social Work, Care Commission). Concerns would be communicated electronically to the Care Commission.
48. There was very little autonomy or discretion given to staff in relation to these matters. Everyone was encouraged to follow the procedures. This was the process also followed and favoured by the MoD.
49. To reduce the likelihood of abuse, ill treatment or inappropriate conduct towards children, these topics were covered during In-service training, child protection courses, PSE programme, Tutor system, on line child protection courses, awareness at House Team meetings.
50. I do think this worked. I can remember the pastoral deputy saying after an inspection by the Care Commission that they were impressed by the awareness of staff as regards Child Protection.

External monitoring

51. There were inspections carried out at the school. The inspections were carried out by HMIE, SCE, Care Commission, Investors in People (en route to gaining the award). In addition our HM Commissioners (Board of Governors), chaired by Prof. Bart McGettrick kept a keen interest in the school.
52. During the inspections they were able to speak to the children, in small groups. Usually mixed across the different boarding houses. Staff were spoken to individually and in groups. Pupils and staff were not mixed. I was spoken to during the inspections. On the conclusion of the inspection, the school did receive reports both written and orally. Pupil and parent satisfaction with the school consistently scored highly.

Record-keeping

53. MoD policy was that individuals should not keep records on pupils unless for academic reasons, reporting etc. Pupils files were kept by the Head Teacher. Staff files were kept by HR Department. In general files were quite comprehensive and were compiled either by the Head Teacher or the Deputy Head (Pastoral).
54. During my time at the school I think the main difference was that all records tended, latterly, to be centralised. I can't recall specifically seeing a pupil "file" with regards to abuse, ill treatment or inappropriate conduct. These were very much kept confidential. The Head always took copious notes. Other records were kept on the school management system.

Investigations into abuse – personal involvement

[REDACTED]

55. I can't recall any allegations of abuse involving a pupil [REDACTED]. I have a vague recollection of complaints that he was being picked on by some boys in the boarding house but I can't recall any specifics.

56. As I said I can't recall this specific incident. In general, however, there had been significant disquiet from staff, and, I think pupils and parents too, re the relationship between Lynn Smith and QRS [REDACTED] as regards the perceived bias from Lynn towards QRS and [REDACTED]. This led to a number of investigations by the MoD re their conduct. As a result of these they were both suspended and later sacked. I was not privy to any of the findings of these investigations

Reports of abuse and civil claims

57. I have not been involved in the handling of reports to, or civil claims made against the school by former pupils, concerning historical abuse.

Police investigations/ criminal proceedings

58. I was not aware of any police investigations into alleged abuse at the school. I have never given a statement to the police or the Crown concerning alleged abuse of children cared for at the school. I have never given evidence at a trial concerning abuse of children cared for at the school.

Convicted abusers

59. I am not aware of any person who worked at the school who was convicted of abuse of a child or children at the school.

Specific alleged abusers

YXL [REDACTED]

60. I do remember YXL [REDACTED]. He was already in post when I started at the school. I believe he started in 1995.
61. YXL [REDACTED] was in his late twenties when I started at the school. He was the [REDACTED] and I was his line manager for the teaching element of his role.
62. My view of him is as a teacher and based purely from his work within the teaching block. I was not aware of any concerns about him in his pastoral role in the boarding house. I did not know him socially, but I was aware he was single and lived on campus at first, but then moved to his own place, I think in Stirling.
63. He was a very good subject teacher and certainly never gave any concern up to the time of the allegations. He was very popular with staff, pupils and parents. He was a very highly effective teacher and [REDACTED] best department in the school. I had more dealings with YXL [REDACTED] as he was a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of the school IT system which I relied on.
64. He was a very quiet, reserved man, but with a sense of humour, whose main interests were, as far as I could make out, computing and Stirling Albion FC. He was always very professional and his documentation was always accurate and on time. He was very organised and got the best out of his pupils. His subject was very popular and always oversubscribed and results were always good. Although he didn't mix socially with the rest of the staff he was popular with them. I never heard anyone say a bad word about him.
65. In general, as I was responsible for the [REDACTED] of the school I was not always aware of the specifics, timelines of incidents or allegations which came under the remit of the Deputy Head (Pastoral) and the Head Teacher.
66. Allegations were made in a letter that YXL [REDACTED] had had an inappropriate relationship with a senior pupil. I am not certain about the exact date. He was suspended from the school pending this investigation. The investigation was undertaken by an external MoD group who came to the school and interviewed the parties named, both denied

the allegations. Several other school staff were also interviewed, including myself. I could not shed any light on the incident. I gather that the investigation came to a 'no case to answer' conclusion.

67. The case was taken up by the GTCS who came to a similar conclusion and deemed YXL fit to return to teaching. His return to Queen Victoria School, I presume, must have been decided or approved by the MoD and the Commissioners.

YNT

68. I do recall YNT. I started in 1997 and I think he joined in 1999. YNT would have been in his late twenties when I joined and he was a teacher of . I was his line manager for the teaching element of his role.

69. My view of YNT is purely from his work within the teaching block. I was not aware of any concerns about him in his pastoral role within the boarding house.

70. I did not know him socially but was aware he was married and lived on campus with his wife and small son. He was a very good subject teacher and certainly gave no cause for concern up to the time of the allegations. He was very popular with staff, pupils and parents.

71. I did not know YNT very well. He played the guitar and had a . He spent a lot of time with his wife and son. I used to see them a lot when I was walking my dog around the campus.

72. Again, in general, I was responsible for the and I was not always aware of the specifics, timelines of incidents or allegations which came under the remit of the Deputy Head (Pastoral) and the Head Teacher.

73. The Housemaster was alerted by a member of staff that there were rumours that YNT had had an inappropriate relationship with a senior pupil. The Housemaster reported this to the Head Teacher who asked him to make preliminary enquiries. The

Housemaster did so, asking the staff member, pupil and other senior pupils. He could not ascertain the origin of the rumours. This was reported to the parent of the pupil.

74. The inquiry moved to an MoD led one and YNT was suspended. The SMT were then effectively out of the loop. During this time YNT resigned from the school. As he had left the employ of the school/MoD and the investigation had not come to a definitive conclusion, I think the investigation was halted. The details of the investigation were never shared with the whole of the SMT. I gather that later there was also a GTCS inquiry. I don't know the outcome of that, although I seem to recall a member of staff say that he had been teaching at a local school. I can't be certain about that.

Specific allegations of abuse made against me for which there has been no criminal investigation and / or conviction

75. There was an occasion, I am not sure of the exact date, when an anonymous letter was put under the door of the then Assistant Head (Pastoral), Lynn Smith. The Head Teacher and Deputy Head (Pastoral) interviewed me for my view of the letter. I can't recall the wording of the letter, but it was along the lines that each teacher was having sexual relations with different senior pupils. There was a sentence stating that one of the pupils involved "has been seen having intercourse with the school SNR SNR Mr. CKC, whilst at a night club in Edinburgh". I seem to recall that the wording of the letter seemed strange/stilted. I can't elaborate on that. It was anonymous and unsigned. I told them it was "rubbish" and totally refuted the allegation. I gather another member of senior staff was spoken to who was of the same opinion.
76. I was spoken to by an external MoD group and once again totally refuted the allegation. The pupil in question was also spoken to by the same MoD group. She too, told them it was totally untrue. This information was passed back to me via the Bursar, I can't recall which bursar it was. They were not reporting solely back to me. Presumably the findings were dealt with as per MoD Procedures. At no time was there any indication from the parents of the pupil that they had any concerns that these allegations might be true. On talking to other prospective parents on Admissions day I found the parents of the girl continued to recommend the school to other parents.

77. I heard nothing more about this matter until several years ago, when an ex-colleague, **QYL** who was on holiday in Australia met two ex-pupils who had settled there. During the conversation they mentioned to him and named the two pupils (from their year group) who had written the letter. They told him they had written it because they had been 'gated' (confined to school for the week-end) and did it out of anger.

Helping the Inquiry

78. As for helping the Inquiry I think the following should be considered and taken into account; careful selection of appropriately qualified staff; very clear guidelines on Child Protection; encourage an environment of openness; establish close links with outside agencies (Care Commission, Social Work, etc); set up tutor systems and "buddy" systems among the pupils; foster a "look out for people" attitude; establish clear lines of reporting; have all the appropriate policies in place, make sure they are read and that they are updated as and when required; keep close contact with parents; always have multiple members of staff on duty in the boarding houses; always have a "Go To" person in charge of Pastoral matters and when in doubt refer it on. The minimum live-in staff after lights out were – Housemaster, Deputy, Matron. In the Girls House this included either a GAP student or/and Assistant Housemistress.

79. I have no objection to my witness statement being published as part of the evidence to the Inquiry. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed..... **CKC**

Dated..... 30 October 2020