

APPENDIX - Queen Victoria School, Dunblane

Part A — Background

1. Characteristics

1.1 History of the Organisation and Establishment

Past

- i. When, how and why was the organisation founded?

The parent organisation to Queen Victoria School is the Ministry of Defence (MOD) (formerly the War Office), a UK Department of State.

- ii. What part did the provision in Scotland of residential care (including foster care) for children play in the organisation's purpose, operation and activities?

Limited to the normal boarding school environment of Queen Victoria School.

- iii. When and how did the organisation become involved in the provision of residential care (including foster care) for children in Scotland?

1905, limited to the normal boarding school environment of Queen Victoria School.

- iv. Why did the organisation consider that it had the competence to be responsible for, and manage the care of, children in establishments?

As a Department of State, the then War Office had access to all necessary skill sets, as well as the appropriate governance and oversight mechanisms.

- v. How many establishments did the organisation run, where were they located, over what period were they in operation, and what were their names?

One establishment only.
Located in Dunblane.
1905 to date.
Queen Victoria School.

- vi. When, how and why was each of these establishments founded?

Established 1905 by the Royal Warrant of His Majesty King Edward VII:
To establish in Scotland an Institution for the reception and education of the sons of Scottish Sailors and Soldiers (and subsequently Airmen), to also act as a National Memorial in Scotland to Her Majesty the late Queen Victoria.

- vii. In the case of any establishment which is no longer in operation, when and why did it cease operating?

N/A.

- viii. If the organisation itself is no longer involved in the provision of residential care for children in Scotland, when and why did it cease to be so involved?

N/A.

ix. If the organisation was founded as a religious order/congregation by members of a particular faith or church, what was the precise relationship between the order/congregation and the religious hierarchy within that faith or church?

N/A.

x. Within the faith or church to which the religious order/congregation belonged, what degree of autonomy was enjoyed by the order in relation to the provision of residential care for children in Scotland?

N/A.

xi. In the case of establishments that were run by members of a religious order/congregation (e.g. Sisters, Brothers), what degree of autonomy within the order itself was enjoyed by such members?

N/A.

Present

xii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

xiii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

1.2 Funding of Establishment

Past

i. How were the establishment's operations and activities, so far as relating to the provision of residential care for children, funded?

By grants of money annually to be voted by Parliament as part of and included in the General Army Estimates, now the Defence Vote.

ii. Was the funding adequate to properly care for the children?

Yes.

iii. If not, why not?

N/A.

iv. What state support did it receive?

Queen Victoria School is state-funded (see above at 1.2.i).

Present

v. If the establishment continues to provide residential care for children, how is that funded?

From the Defence Vote (see above at 1.2.i).

- vi. What state support does it receive?

Queen Victoria School is state-funded (see above at 1.2.i).

1.3 Legal Status

(a) Organisation

Past

- i. What was the legal status of the organisation since it was founded?

The legal status of the War Office (now MOD) as a Department of State.

- ii. Were there any changes in the legal status of the organisation since it was founded?

None of significance to Queen Victoria School.

- iii. What, if any, material changes were there to the legal status of the organisation?

None.

- iv. What was the legal basis which authorised or enabled the organisation to become responsible for the provision of residential care, (including foster care) for children in Scotland?

The formal commitment of the then Secretary of War under a binding legal Constitution and Minute of Agreement, and an associated Royal Warrant.

- v. Did that legal basis require the organisation to meet, or fulfil, any legal and/or regulatory requirements in respect of children in its care? If so, please give details.

As a Department of State, the War Office (now MOD) was required to meet all relevant statutory direction in respect of the children at the school.

- vi. Did the organisation have a legal duty of care to each child in its care?

Yes – the duty to take such reasonable care as a reasonable person placed in the circumstances would take to protect children in its care from reasonably foreseeable harm.

Present

- vii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- viii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

ix. If the organisation is a Scottish local authority, please provide details of the predecessor authorities for the local authority area for which the authority is now responsible, and the time periods during which these authorities were the responsible authority for the area, or any part thereof.

N/A.

(b) Establishment

Past

i. Did the establishment have a special legal, statutory or other status?

Yes. Established under a binding legal Constitution and Minute of Agreement, and an associated Royal Warrant.

ii. If not, how was the establishment described?

N/A.

iii. What was the legal basis which authorised, or enabled, the establishment to become responsible for managing the care of children in a residential setting?

A binding legal Constitution and Minute of Agreement, and an associated Royal Warrant.

iv. Did that legal basis require the establishment, or its management, to meet, or fulfil, any legal and/or regulatory requirements in respect of children in its care? If so, please give details.

Queen Victoria School was (and is) required to meet all relevant statutory direction in respect of the children at the school.

v. Did the establishment have a legal duty of care to each child in its care?

Yes – the duty to take such reasonable care as a reasonable person placed in the circumstances would take to protect children in its care from reasonably foreseeable harm.

vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

vii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

1.4 Legal Responsibility

(a) Organisation

Past

i. Did the organisation have any legal responsibility for the children in its care?

None beyond the legal duty of care described at 1.3(b)v. above.

- ii. If so, what was the nature and extent of that legal responsibility?

N/A.

- iii. Did any other person or organisation have any legal responsibility for the children while they were in the organisation's care?

Yes: Parents/Guardians.

- iv. If so, what was the nature and extent of that responsibility?

Parents/Guardians retained full parental rights and responsibilities.

- v. If the organisation had no legal responsibility for children in its care, where or with whom did legal responsibility lie?

Parents/Guardians.

Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No

- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

(b) Establishment

Past

- i. Did the establishment, or those in charge of the establishment, have any separate legal responsibility (separate from the organisation) for children in its care?

None beyond the legal duty of care described at 1.3(b)v. above.

- ii. If so, what was the nature of that responsibility?

N/A.

Present

- iii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- iv. If so, please give details.

N/A.

1.5 Ethos

(a) Organisation

Past

- i. What did the organisation see as its function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the residential care service it provided for children?

To establish and maintain Queen Victoria School as an Institution for the reception and education of the sons of Scottish Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen, as directed in the Queen Victoria School Constitution and Royal Warrant, for children between the ages of 10 and 18.

- ii. If the establishment was run by a Catholic religious order/congregation, what vows were taken by members of the order/congregation (e.g. Sisters, Brothers) and at which point in their training?

N/A. The Royal Warrant directs that the nature of the School shall be strictly non-sectarian.

- iii. What did the organisation see as the establishment's function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the service that the establishment provided to children accommodated there?

Limited to Queen Victoria School - see 1.5.(b) below.

- iv. Were there changes over time in terms of what the organisation saw as its function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the residential care service it provided for children?

No fundamental changes.

- v. If so, what were the changes and when and why did they come into effect?

N/A.

- vi. Were there changes over time in terms of what the organisation saw as the establishment's function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the service that the establishment provided to children accommodated there?

No fundamental changes.

- vii. If so, what were the changes and when and why did they come into effect?

N/A.

- viii. What was the organisation's attitude to discipline of children?

As a Department of State the War Office/MOD attitude reflected contemporary government policy, principally through following statutory direction in relevant legislation.

- ix. Were there changes over time in terms of the organisation's attitude to discipline of children?

As above.

- x. If so, what were the changes and when and why did they come into effect?

As above.

Present

- xi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- xii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

(b) Establishment

Past

- i. What services were provided at the establishment, in terms of care for children?

Normal school teaching and boarding facilities for children aged 10 to 18.

- ii. Did the establishment care for children of both sexes?

The 1905 Constitution and Royal Warrant specified a boys-only school. Queen Victoria School become co-educational under the Royal Warrant of 1992.

- iii. If the establishment cared for children of one sex only, what was the thinking behind that policy?

This reflected social norms in 1905.

- iv. Were any special child care, or child protection measures, taken in the light of that policy? If so, please provide details.

None beyond those measures required for a boarding school of the time (single-sex until 1992; co-educational thereafter).

- v. What was the daily routine for boys/girls cared for at the establishment?

Normal academic and social development activities associated with contemporary educational practice of the time.

- vi. What were the on-site activities for children cared for at the establishment?

A range of Academic, sporting and pastoral activities following the Scottish National Curriculum (and its predecessor curricula) as directed in the Royal Warrant.

- vii. What were the off-site activities for them?

A range of Academic, sporting and pastoral activities following the Scottish National Curriculum (and its predecessor curricula) as directed in the Royal Warrant.

viii. Did children work manually, either at the establishment, or externally (e.g. farming work or other labour), or both?

Not as far as we are aware from existing records.

ix. If the establishment was run by a Catholic religious order/congregation, were any prospective members of the order/congregation who were in training,(e.g. those training to become Sisters or Brothers) permitted to care for children?

N/A. The Royal Warrant directs that the nature of the School shall be strictly non-sectarian.

x. What was the establishment's attitude to discipline of children?

As 1.5(a).viii above.

xi. Were there changes over time in terms of the establishment's attitude to discipline of children?

As above.

xii. If so, what were the changes and when and why did they come into effect?

As above.

Present

xiii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

xiv. If so, please give details.

N/A.

1.6 Numbers

(a) Organisation

Past

i. How many children did the organisation accommodate at a time and in how many establishments?

In one establishment (Queen Victoria School); rising from 250 in 1930 to 277 in 2014, aged between 10 and 18.

ii. Please provide details of any material changes in numbers of children, or numbers of establishments, and the reasons for those changes?

A minor increase in capacity at Queen Victoria School to reflect increasing demand for school places from eligible parents.

iii. How many children in total were accommodated by the organisation?

Approximately 4200.

- iv. What numbers (if any) were placed in foster care by the organisation?

None that we are aware of.

- v. In general terms, was the main service provided by the organisation the provision of residential care for children in establishments, or was it the provision of foster care?

Neither. It was the education and boarding of the children of Scottish Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen.

Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

(b) Establishment

Past

- i. How many children did the establishment accommodate at a time?

250 In 1930, rising to 277 in 2014, aged 10 to 18.

- ii. Did this change, and if so, what were the reasons?

A minor increase in capacity at Queen Victoria School to reflect increasing demand for school places from eligible parents.

- iii. How many children in total were cared for at the establishment?

Approximately 4200.

- iv. What accommodation was provided for the children?

Boarding school accommodation provided to contemporary norms.

- v. How many children occupied a bedroom/dormitory/house?

Living accommodation for pupils was originally large dormitories. From about 1980 there was a gradual move away from the dormitories to rooms housing 1 to 4 pupils depending on their ages.

Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

vii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

1.7 Children's Background/Experience

Past

i. Did the children admitted to the establishment generally have a shared background and/or shared experiences?

Yes: they were the children of members of the UK Armed Forces.

ii. Were children admitted into the care of the organisation as a whole, or were they admitted into the care of a particular establishment?

Admitted to Queen Victoria School only.

iii. If children were admitted into the care of the organisation, did the organisation decide which establishment they would be admitted into?

N/A.

iv. Who placed children with the organisation?

Eligible Parents/Guardians.

v. From 15 April 1971 (the date on which the Children's Hearing system was introduced), did the organisation/establishment receive children mainly from the Children's Hearing system?

No.

vi. If not, how generally did children come to be admitted into the care of the organisation?

Through application by eligible Parents/Guardians following the admission procedures laid down in the Royal Warrant.

vii. Was there a gender or other admission policy or practice operated by the organisation or any establishment run by it?

Only that reflecting the male-only admission criteria laid down in the 1905 Constitution and Royal Warrant; and the change to co-educational entry laid down in the 1992 Royal Warrant.

viii. What was the policy/procedure and practice regarding admission of siblings?

The Queen Victoria School admissions process paid due regard to siblings of existing pupils, but there was no automatic admission.

ix. How long did children typically remain in the care of the organisation?

Up to a maximum of 8 years; driven by academic achievement, parental choice, continued suitability for boarding and statutory school leaving age.

x. Were children moved between different establishments run by the organisation?

No.

xi. If so, in what circumstances?

N/A.

xii. Generally did children typically stay in one, or more than one, establishment?

N/A.

xiii. What provision was made for contact between siblings while siblings were at the establishment?

Unrestricted.

xiv. What provision was made for contact between children and their parents and wider family while children were at the establishment?

To the best of our knowledge we believe that no restrictions were placed on access beyond those normal for a boarding school of the time.

xv. What provision was made for information sharing/updates about the children to their parents?

To the best of our knowledge we believe that information was shared, or able to be shared, reflecting the normal practices of a boarding school of the time.

xvi. What provision was made for information sharing/updates about parents to their children?

As above, and as requested by the parents.

xvii. What provision was made for the celebration of children's birthdays, Christmas and other special occasions?

As above, and as requested by the parents.

xviii. What was the process for review of children's continued residence at the establishment, in terms of whether they continued to require to be there?

Parental decision, subject to academic progress and continued suitability for boarding.

xix. When children left the care of the establishment, what was the process for discharge?

Normal school leaving process.

xx. What support was offered to children when they left the care of the establishment?

Normal school career advice processes.

xxi. What information was sought by the organisation and/or establishment about what children leaving its care planned to go on to do?

Because the school had no legal care responsibility only information related to normal school career advice processes.

xxii. Was such information retained and updated?

Retained in educational and pastoral pupil records.

xxiii. What was provided in terms of after-care for children/young people once they left the establishment?

N/A.

Present

xxiv. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

xxv. If so, please give details.

N/A.

1.8 Staff Background

(a) Organisation

Past

i. How many people were employed by the organisation who had some responsibility for residential care services for children?

None. The War Office/Ministry of Defence had no statutory responsibility for the provision of residential care services for children in Scotland beyond the welfare/pastoral provision at Queen Victoria School described at 1.8.(b).iii below.

ii. How many people were employed by the organisation at any one time who had some responsibility for residential care services for children?

None. The War Office/Ministry of Defence had no statutory responsibility for the provision of residential care services for children beyond the welfare/pastoral provision at Queen Victoria School described at 1.8.(b).iii below.

iii. What experience/qualifications did such staff have?

N/A.

iv. If the organisation is a religious order/congregation, how many members (e.g. Sisters, Brothers) of the order/congregation had a responsibility for residential care services for children provided by the organisation in Scotland?

N/A.

- v. What experience/qualifications did such members have, to equip them to discharge their responsibilities?

N/A.

Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

(b) Establishment

Past

- i. How many persons were employed in some capacity at the establishment?

26 in 1930 rising to 80 in 2014.

- ii. How many of those persons had the opportunity of unaccompanied access to a child, or children, cared for at the establishment?

To the best of our knowledge only those with the appropriate vetting. All teaching staff were vetted in line with national statutory requirements of the time. Since 2003 non-teaching staff were required to be Scottish Social Services Council registered. Since 2011 all staff have been PVG registered. By 2014 all teachers were GTCS registered.

- iii. How many were involved in the provision of care to children accommodated at the establishment (child care workers)?

The School did not provide residential care services in a Social Care context and did not employ Child Care Workers, but remained instead an establishment to provide for the boarding education of the children of Scottish Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen. Appropriate support/facilities were provided through House Staff and School Nurses; these numbered 7 in 1930 rising to 20 in 2014 (and totalled approximately 130 different staff over the period).

- iv. What experience and/or qualifications, if any, did the child care workers require to have?

See 1.8(b)ii. above. House Masters/Mistresses responsible for the boarding houses were experienced and qualified teachers; the experience/qualifications requirement for non-teaching house staff increased over the period to that described above.

- v. What experience and/or qualifications, if any, did professional non-residential staff or people with access to children have? (e.g. day teachers, non-residential social workers)

As 1.8(b)ii. and iii. Above. Any external visitors to the School would either have had appropriate vetting, or would have been escorted by appropriately vetted/qualified school staff.

- vi. What was the child care worker/child numbers ratio?

The ratio was 7 non-teaching staff to 250 pupils in 1930; rising to 20 non-teaching staff to 277 pupils in 2014.

- vii. What was the gender balance of the child care workers?

We do not hold this information.

- viii. Was any attempt made to employ child care workers in looking after children of the same sex as those workers?

We are not aware of any such attempt.

Present

- ix. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- x. If so, please give details.

N/A.

2. Organisational Structure and Oversight

2.1 Governance

Past

- i. What were the governance arrangements within the organisation?

As directed by the Royal Warrant. Overall responsibility remained with the Secretary of State for Defence through a Board of Her Majesty's Commissioners under the authority and direction of a Royal Warrant and legally binding Constitution.

- ii. How were the members of the governing body selected?

As directed by the Royal Warrant, including as ex officio members in 1930 both the Secretary of State for Scotland (as President of the Board), and the Lord Justice General, as well as the Assistant Secretary of the Scottish Education Department. The Royal Warrant of 1999 specified that the Board of Her Majesty's Commissioners was thereafter to include six persons with expertise in education, business, finance and the professions.

- iii. What qualifications and/or training, if any, did the members require to have in relation to the provision of residential care services for children?

In 1930 this was largely post dependent. The Secretary of State for Scotland and the Lord Justice General were standing members. Other members were

serving military officers appointed by the Adjutant General. There was no specific training required. Latterly, the composition of the Board has diversified to include other military services and civilians with experience in education (and no longer includes the Secretary of State for Scotland). By the end of this period, all Commissioners were required to be PVG registered and to complete Induction Training (which included specific safeguarding briefings on pastoral care and child social care).

iv. Did the members receive remuneration?

No.

v. What was the nature of the accountability and oversight regime between the organisation's governing body and the establishment?

As laid down in the Royal Warrant, the Board retained responsibility for the overall government of the School on behalf of the Secretary of State for Defence. The Adjutant General and the Head of the Army's Educational and Training Services (and their successor posts) represented the Secretary of State on the Board and performed an oversight function. Additionally, Commissioners have always been accountable to the appropriate Service body or bodies i.e. the Army, Navy or Air Force Boards.

vi. What visits were made by the governing body to the establishment?

1930: not known. By the end of the period, regular Board meetings were held on site. Sub-committee meetings have been held as required. Visits to Boarding Houses were arranged a few times per year, with individual Commissioners visiting as required.

vii. What was the purpose of such visits?

General Governance. Reviews of Hardship cases. Overview of Health and Safety. General Education and Wellbeing. Involved in recruitment decisions. Involved in some disciplinary cases for pupils and staff.

viii. How frequently did these happen?

Board and Committee meetings both at least one per term (three per year); visiting Commissioner visits conducted at least once per term.

ix. Were children interviewed, or spoken to, by members of the governing body during such visits?

To the best of our knowledge yes, and certainly in the later years of the period.

x. If so, were establishment staff present while children were interviewed or spoken to?

To the best of our knowledge yes, and certainly in the later years of the period.

xi. Were reports of such visits made and discussed by the governing body?

Yes.

xii. Did visits result in changes to the organisation's policy, procedure and/or practice? If so, please give examples.

No fundamental changes, but contributed to what would today be described as a regime of continuous improvement and sharing of best practice.

Present

xiii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

xiv. If so, please give details.

N/A.

2.2 Culture

Past

i. What was the nature of the culture within the organisation?

As 'the Organisation' is a Department of State it is challenging to provide a meaningful response to this question in an educational/boarding context.

ii. Was that culture reflected in the organisation's policies, procedures and/or practice in relation the provision of residential care services for children?

N/A.

iii. How can that be demonstrated?

N/A.

iv. Did the running of establishments reflect the organisation's culture, policies and procedures?

In regard to culture see 2.2.i above; in regard to policies and procedures, yes.

v. If not, please provide a representative range of examples and explain, by reference to those examples, why particular establishments were not, in material ways, run in accordance with the organisation's then culture, policies and procedures and what, if anything, was done to change that state of affairs?

N/A.

vi. When and why did any changes in the culture of the organisation come about?

None in the context of this establishment, beyond the broad changes required over the years to follow evolving legislation and best practice in the running of a boarding school in Scotland, and to reflect relevant societal shifts.

vii. Were any changes in culture driven by internal influences, incidents, experiences or events within the organisation, or any of the establishments run by the organisation?

As 2.2.vi above, complemented by the MOD's experience of running day and boarding schools in overseas locations outside the UK, as well as military training establishments for young service personnel under 18 years of age.

- viii. Were there any changes in culture that were driven by abuse, or alleged abuse, of children cared for at the establishment?

Although each of the incidents/allegations we are aware of (see Part B) were appropriately assessed, none required a significant change in culture beyond the routine changes described at 2.2.vi. and vii. above.

- ix. If so, when did they occur and how did they manifest themselves?

N/A.

- x. Were any changes in culture driven by any external influences or factors and if so what were those influences or factors?

None beyond those identified at 2.2.vi., vii., and viii. above.

Present

- xi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- xii. If so, please give details.

N/A.

- xiii. To what extent, if any, has abuse or alleged abuse of children cared for at any establishments caused, or contributed to, the adoption of the current policies, procedures and/or practices of the organisation, in relation to the provision of residential care services for children including the safeguarding and child protection arrangements applying to its current establishments?

Within the wider MOD context, current policies, procedures and practices reflect a range of factors and directly benefit the School. These factors include a detailed understanding of current MOD safeguarding practices (updated to reflect current national legislation and statutory guidance); increases in the number and skills of MOD safeguarding policy staff; the role of the MOD Safeguarding Children Board; the sharing of experience and good practice from other MOD schools outside Scotland; and the MOD's specific understanding of the unique pressures placed on Service children/pupils (including those that constitute the QVS school roll) by Service life, notably driven by frequent family moves, separation, and the deployment of parents on operations.

2.3 Leadership

Past

- i. How was the establishment managed and led?

Under the terms of the Royal Warrant, initially through a Commandant responsible for the general supervision and control of the School, assisted by a Head Teacher. The 1992 revision to the Royal Warrant reflected the change in 1990 to remove the post of Commandant and place full responsibility on the Head Teacher, supported by a bursar, who was to be appointed by the Secretary of State.

- ii. What were the names and qualifications of the persons in charge of the establishment? Please include the dates for when each of the persons was in charge.

As Commandant (for whom we do not hold information on educational or related qualifications):

1929-39: Colonel S A Innes, Black Watch
 1939-40: Lieutenant Colonel G E Hall, Royal Scots
 1940-43: Major W L Clarke, Army Education Corps
 1943-44: Major W F Hawkins, Army Education Corps
 1944-50: Lieutenant Colonel G E Hall, Royal Scots
 1950-56: Lieutenant Colonel R F Nason, Seaforth Highlanders
 1956-64: Brigadier A M Finlaison CBE, DSO, Cameronians
 1964-74: Brigadier M R J Hope Thomson DSO, OBE, MC, Royal Scots Fusiliers
 1974-85: Brigadier H H M Marston MC, Argyle & Sutherland Highlanders
 1985-90: Brigadier O R Tweedy MC, Black Watch

As Head Teacher:

1990-94: Mr JD Hankinson MA
 1994-06: Mr B Raine BA (Hons), PGCE
 2007-16: Mrs W Bellars MA (Hons), PGCE, DipEd, MA (Ed Man)

- iii. What was the oversight and supervision arrangements by senior management within the establishment?

By the Commandant/Head Teacher (see 2.3.i above) through Heads of Departments/Senior Teachers and School Bursar/School Business Manager.

- iv. What were the oversight arrangements by the organisation, including visits by or on behalf of the organisation?

See 2.1.v above. The oversight of Queen Victoria School by the Secretary of State for Defence has evolved over the period and has seen an increasing use of professionally qualified teaching and safeguarding staff from the Ministry of Defence providing both advice and second party assurance during formal and informal visits to the School. By 2014 the School had been integrated with other MOD schools outside Scotland, within the MOD Directorate Children and Young People.

Present

- v. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

- vi. If so, please give details

N/A.

2.4 Structure

Past

- i. What was the structure of the organisation?

The structure of a Department of State

- ii. What was the structure of the establishment?

Normal structure for a state or independent boarding school of the time.

Present

- iii. With reference to the present position, is the answer to the above question different?

No.

- iv. If so, please give details.

N/A.

2.5 Hierarchy and Control

Past

- i. What was the hierarchy within the organisation?

The hierarchy of a Department of State, under a Secretary of State.

- ii. What was the structure of responsibility within the organisation?

The structure of a Department of State, under the overall responsibility of a Secretary of State.

- iii. What were the lines of accountability?

As for a Department of State (but see 2.5.iv below).

- iv. Within the organisation, who had senior management/corporate/ organisational responsibility for the managers/management teams/leadership teams who managed the establishment on a day-to-day basis?

See 2.1.v and 2.1.iv above. Overall responsibility remained with the Secretary of State for Defence, but this responsibility was routinely delegated to the Adjutant General of the Army (and his successor post), with day-to-day responsibility held by the MOD Directorate Children and Young People (and its predecessor organisations).

- v. What were the reporting arrangements between the establishment and the organisation?

Prior to 1991 routine reporting to the Army/MOD. In 1992 the School became a Defence Agency of the MOD, reporting via MOD to Parliament pursuant to Section 7 of the Government Resources and Accounts Act 2000. In 2005 the School ceased to be an Agency and reported thereafter to the MOD Directorate Children and Young People (and its predecessor organisations).

vi. Within the establishment itself, who had managerial responsibility for, or was in overall charge of, those employed there, including in particular those who were involved in the day-to-day care of children, and any other persons who had contact with the children?

The Commandant (1930-1990); the Head Teacher (1990 to date) (See 2.3.i above).

vii. To whom were child care workers within the establishment directly responsible?

House staff were directly responsible to House Masters/Mistresses.

viii. Who, within the organisation, took decisions on matters of policy, procedure and/or practice in relation to the establishment?

The MOD Director Children and Young People (and his predecessor posts), on behalf of the Adjutant General (and his successor post), in conjunction with Her Majesty's Commissioners.

ix. Who, within the organisation, was responsible for the implementation of, and compliance with, the organisation's policies, procedures and/or practices at the establishment?

The MOD Director Children and Young People (and his predecessor posts), in conjunction with Her Majesty's Commissioners.

Present

x. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

There has been no significant change since 2014.

xi. If so, please give details.

N/A.

2.6 External Oversight

Past

i. What were the arrangements for external oversight of the organisation and the establishment?

Through routine inspections by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education and by the Care Inspectorate; and by their predecessor organisations. In addition, the School was routinely visited by relevant specialists from within the Ministry of Defence, as described at 2.3.iv above.

ii. Who visited the organisation and/or the establishment in an official or statutory capacity and for what purpose?

As above: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education and the Care Inspectorate, and their predecessor equivalents.

iii. How often did this occur?

As laid down by Statute. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education: annually, but satisfactory assessments lead to longer intervals. Care Inspectorate: annually.

iv. What did these visits involve in practice?

A formal assessment of the quality of teaching and learning (Her Majesty's Inspectorate); and a formal assessment of the quality of care and support, environment, staffing, and management and leadership (Care Inspectorate).

v. What involvement did local authorities have with the organisation and/or the establishment in respect of residential care services for children?

N/A. The School did not provide residential care services in a Social Care context, but remained instead an establishment to provide for the boarding education of the children of Scottish Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen.

vi. What involvement did local authorities have with the organisation and the establishment in respect of the children at the establishment?

No direct formal involvement.

vii. If the establishment was run by a Catholic religious order/congregation, what actual involvement and/or responsibility, whether formal or informal, did the Catholic Hierarchy/Bishops' Conference have, either directly or at diocesan level, in the creation, governance, management and/or oversight of the establishment?

N/A. The Royal Warrant directs that the nature of the School shall be strictly non-sectarian.

viii. What was the nature and extent of any pastoral care provided to the establishment, if it was run by a religious order/congregation?

N/A.

Present

ix. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No.

x. If so, please give details.

N/A.

Part B — Current Statement**3. Retrospective Acknowledgement/Admission****3.1 Acknowledgement of Abuse**

- i. Does the organisation/establishment accept that between 1930 and 17 December 2014 some children cared for at the establishment were abused?

Yes. Based on the records available to us we are only aware of 5 allegations, in the periods: 1947-53; 1977-79; 1981-82; the 1980s; and 2001-02. Two of these allegations were upheld, and none led to criminal convictions.

- ii. What is the organisation/establishment's assessment of the extent and scale of such abuse?

As above at 3.1.i.

- iii. What is the basis of that assessment?

Based on records available to us.

3.2 Acknowledgement of Systemic Failures

- i. Does the organisation/establishment accept that its systems failed to protect children cared for at the establishment between 1930 and 17 December 2014 from abuse?

See 3.1.i above. Although the 2 upheld allegations represent an individual failure of systems to protect children, based on the 5 allegations of which we are aware we have not identified any systemic failures in the MOD's or the School's processes for protecting children.

- ii. What is the organisation/establishment's assessment of the extent of such systemic failures?

Based on the information we are aware of, we do not believe there have been any systemic failures.

- iii. What is the basis of that assessment?

Based on the records available to us.

- iv. What is the organisation/establishment's explanation for such failures?

N/A.

3.3 Acknowledgement of Failures/Deficiencies in Response

- i. Does the organisation/establishment accept that there were failures and/or deficiencies in its response to abuse, and allegations of abuse, of children cared for at the establishment between 1930 and 17 December 2014?

Based on the records available to us we consider that the five allegations that we are aware of were dealt with appropriately at the time.

ii. What is the organisation/establishment's assessment of the extent of such failures in its response?

We have not identified any significant failings in the MOD's or the School's processes.

iii. What is the basis of that assessment?

Analysis of the records available to us and the 5 known allegations.

iv. What is the organisation's explanation for such failures/deficiencies?

N/A.

3.4 Changes

i. To what extent has the organisation/establishment implemented changes to its policies/procedures and practices as a result of its acknowledgment in relation to 3.1 - 3.3 above?

Our policies/procedures have been routinely and regularly updated in line with changes in the relevant legislation and routine advice from professional bodies.