1	Thursday, 11 November 202
2	(10.00 am)
3	LADY SMITH: Good morning. As you may all appreciate, this
4	morning we turn to closing submissions in this part of
5	the boarding schools case study.
6	Before I invite Senior Counsel to the Inquiry to
7	address me, could I just tell everybody I am going to
8	observe the two-minute silence at 11 o'clock. It may
9	well be that that is a convenient stopping point in any
10	event for the morning break, and if so, we'll take
11	a break and the two-minute silence will be privately
12	observed by those who wish to do so.
13	But now I'll turn to Mr Brown and invite him to
14	address me when he's ready.
15	Closing submissions by Mr Brown QC
16	MR BROWN: My Lady, good morning.
17	Briefly, because obviously my submissions will
18	formally wait until we've heard from all seven schools,
19	but some observations, just as I made after hearing the
20	phase involving Loretto and Morrison's.
21	First of all, I'm grateful to Gordonstoun and QVS
22	for providing their submissions, with which I take no
23	issue, obviously. There is no challenge to the evidence
24	of the applicants of the abuse.
25	We've had an interesting four and a bit weeks of

evidence. It's been interesting in particular because one point, which I think sometimes was present in the background, is a feeling that boarding schools somehow are not a place where abuse could take place and victims could be traumatised. They are, after all, rich kids whose parents are wealthy. That is the perception.

That, of course, is entirely wrong, and the Inquiry was, in my submission, entirely right to consider boarding schools as a particular chapter, because we have heard compelling evidence of a wide range of abuse and very real trauma, put most articulately, perhaps, by 'Martin' from QVS who said, having been challenged by a victim of abuse in another setting, that his views weren't really of any worth, as he said:

"My trauma is every bit as real to me as his was to him."

And that's, of course, right. And it was interesting that those views were echoed by Helen Holland when she made comments to the BBC having listened to 'Jane', one of the Gordonstoun pupils, and her evidence.

So I think that's been an important scene-setter for the whole chapter of boarding schools, and an important one.

We've heard from 79 witnesses over the last month by

a variety of means; obviously a number of read-ins, emphasised by the ongoing pandemic, but interesting nonetheless. It is, of course, still the position that for many school was good, although I would say that a distinction that might be drawn from this phase, as opposed to the first phase, the Loretto and Morrison's phase, was there was much more challenge to the benefit of the education received at a number of the schools. In some cases it was felt to be very poor, along with a culture that was abusive.

It has, of course, been very interesting to hear from past heads and also the current heads, and in that regard again I repeat what I said on the last occasion, that it's been very striking that current heads and current Chairs of Boards or Commissioners have been present either physically or online throughout their respective chapters of evidence, and that only emphasises the seriousness which they take the Inquiry's work, and that is, of course, entirely commendable.

What was perhaps also different about this chapter is we were dealing with three very different schools.

There were broad similarities perhaps between Loretto and Morrison's in that they were the same type of school doing the same type of thing, but here we had different schools all set up with the best of intentions but for

very different purposes.

With Gordonstoun, as it was described, a culture of committing itself to expeditionary education and the work of Kurt Hahn; with QVS, a school for the children of Scottish servicemen; and with Keil, a school initially set up as a technical college in Kintyre, but thinking of the education of children from the West of Scotland and the Isles, all very worthwhile, all well-intended, but all, despite their differing characters, with recurring themes of failure and abuse, largely in the period from the 1960s to the 1990s.

Yesterday the Inquiry published its findings about Marist Brothers and their particular approach to education at two schools. Inevitably perhaps, because it's the educational world, there are similarities with the themes developed in the Marist hearing, the most obvious of which was sexual abuse by teachers.

It happened in all three schools that we were investigating in this chapter, on the evidence, with Aberlour, KME, Jones and a gap year student at Gordonstoun, Andrew Keir; QVS, I suggest, clearly, and this is recognised in the submissions by QVS, Ben Philip; and at Keil, perhaps on the most appalling scale and level, William Bain, and, I would suggest on the evidence, of predatory behaviour by 'Richard'.

It was particularly striking, I would suggest, in relation to Bain that he was so clear that he doubted his abuse would ever be discovered, and if discovered, the children wouldn't be believed. Such were the conditions that existed in that school that he felt untouchable.

What is also interesting in relation to the sexual abuse is the similarities with three of the abusers that there was ongoing and persistent contact with their victims by correspondence and encouragement for further contact. That, I think, was distinct in some respects from the evidence we heard in the first phase that, although Guy Ray-Hills obviously liked to maintain contact, but in this instance it appears to have been positively predatory and very, very deliberate and persistent.

Another common feature, and in this set of hearings obviously we heard from convicted abusers, was their capacity for deceit and self-delusion, which was breathtaking in its arrogance and absurdity. That is something that I know your Ladyship is contemplating in other fora. We also heard, common to the first set of hearings, voyeuristic practices, principally at Aberlour.

Again, another common theme with the Marists and

Morrison's and Loretto is the excessive punishments by staff that could never have been appropriate under a regime of corporal punishment, in the worst cases involving what one applicant positively believed was sadism and you'll remember a number of teachers were described as frothing at the mouth and becoming excited by what they were doing. There was violence in the sense of more than six, the maximum allowed, there was violence in terms of physical injury, there was abuse in the sense children were talking about not being able to sit for days.

Of course, common to this, and underpinning much of it, was the emotional abuse which has manifested as fear by children at every level of their lives at school.

One very stark difference, though, from the Marists, however, is the scale of peer-on-peer abuse we have seen with the boarding schools, both physical and sexual with the attendant emotional trauma. That is, of course, a continuation of a theme from Loretto and Morrison's and demonstrates a lack of control by staff who were, on the evidence, happy to delegate control of boarding houses to senior pupils, and I think there is universal condemnation and realisation that as a system of education, that is simply hopeless. From today's eyes, it is astounding it was tried, and, particularly with

Keil, to the level it was used.

The same is true of the autonomy of houses, which ties in with that delegation of control because it allowed rampant bullying to go unchecked, with dreadful consequences for pupils and a constant feeling of fear. Your Ladyship will remember Dr Mann, who interestingly was the first witness to speak on a theme which was new, which was racism, and peppered the hearings, particularly at Gordonstoun, talking about bullying. As he said:

"You never knew when it was going to happen and from where it was going to happen, so you would be walking down to your dinner and suddenly somebody would come up and just give you the worst dead arm, dead leg for the reason they enjoyed it. They thought it was fun. So there was no moment in the day when you didn't walk from A to B to C when you didn't somehow suspect somebody could or would come up to you from some angle to verbally abuse you, physically abuse you. That was the real stress, you couldn't see it coming and there was no catalyst that you could see that would allow you to predict or protect yourself at any time. It would just happen. It was considered sport. It was sport. It was fun to those who would impose it on others."

LADY SMITH: Now, we heard much from those who were victims

of abuse about how it meant they lived in a state of
anxiety and fear all the time. An abuse-free day didn't
mean it was a good day, I think.

MR BROWN: No. And as your Ladyship will recall, that way of living drove children to the extremes.

LADY SMITH: Yes.

MR BROWN: We heard in the evidence of two pupils who either attempted suicide, 'Felix' at QVS, or contemplated it, with 'Angus' at Keil, and his words are horrifying, as he said on Day 244:

"A lot of my memories from Keil, certainly in third, fourth and fifth year, are sitting at the top of the quarry there and thinking of reasons not to jump off."

And what was worse, of course, and again reflects a theme that was prevalent, certainly in some decades: no one noticed he was away. It is the perfect storm of horror for a childhood, and it reflects a culture of a lack of oversight by staff, which was deliberate, particularly at Keil, where lack of funds drove processes which might have been acceptable in a small school in the 1930s and 1940s but was plainly hopeless from the 1950s on as numbers grew. The fact it persisted at Keil into the 1990s, on the evidence, is remarkable but is perhaps underscored by the financial problems and focus that those running the school had to

take just to keep the place going.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But the cultures we see across all the schools, again, it's the same themes. We have a culture of ignoring what was known and obvious. The worst, undoubtedly, again, is Keil and William Bain. On the evidence it was known, because parents reported it, from the early 1990s that he appeared to be abusing children, but that did not go on his record, as was said to happen, and more strikingly still, it was not shared with the new headmaster, it would appear, when he took over, notwithstanding there was a common deputy head, who on one view of the evidence had been present when Bain was challenged in the first place, and in any event was aware, from other evidence, of broad concerns. Certainly his behaviour was a known quantity, in my respectful submission, the denials of any knowledge are perhaps not the most compelling.

The same is true with Andrew Keir, though, opportunities were missed with him. Interestingly, because of inadequate record-keeping, a crucial document went in the wrong file and a culture that in today's eye was inadequate in terms of references and the sharing of relevant information, things were known but not put in references.

Other cultural traits are as important, though: the

code of silence, the omerta, as one witness called it, 1 was corrosive and toxic. It's a code which would appear 2 to apply between pupils and staff, but also between 3 staff and school, on occasion. Either way, the culture 4 5 of silence in all schools is something that has to 6 change and there has to be meaningful ways of 7 information-sharing. I'll come back to that, because 8 clearly there has been progress. 9 LADY SMITH: Yes. MR BROWN: But not as far as one might ideally hope. 10 LADY SMITH: And allied to that is not being sidelined by

11 12 a desire not to damage a colleague's career.

> MR BROWN: Well, there are interesting aspects to that, not just not wanting to damage a colleague's career, but also from the pupil's side, not wanting to upset or harm parents.

LADY SMITH: Of course.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR BROWN: Again, it's just all playing to the same dangers, because perhaps, understandably at human level, emotions were emotions that simply have no place in the open culture which is required in a school.

> What was remarkable, of course, with QVS in particular, though, I think this is the first and only time we've heard it, but from two sources, teachers were positively encouraging children not to speak. They

understood that and shared it with their charges, which is astounding.

There was also a lack of system of complaint,

a culture of silence, a culture of failing to have

proper records, a culture of failing to report,

a culture of failing to be frank with other schools and

moving teachers on for convenience. Again, that has

been alluded to, and, perhaps most fundamentally,

a culture of having no one identified you could talk to.

We heard of the impact for many of the pupils living under such conditions, but it's important to emphasise that although we are only hearing from them, they were also speaking more broadly. It wasn't just them. They spoke to many, many pupils enduring isolation and an inability to talk. They were speaking of a culture of fear and abuse and of isolation that affected potentially all pupils.

We've also seen, continuing the theme of the lack of openness and appointments, reliance, for example, on friends to take jobs, as well as failures to be open about those under investigation or those leaving under a cloud, the importance of objectivity when dealing with these things and one thinks obviously of the experience of Wendy Bellars who I think acknowledged that perhaps her approach had been less than ideal.

1 LADY SMITH: Yes.

MR BROWN: There was also at QVS a culture of office politics as well as pettiness and bitchiness which may, or at least theoretically could, have led to child protection issues being missed. There was also a common theme of a lack of proper governance at board level at all three schools in the past, though I emphasise that clearly now with the two schools that remain open, the world is very much better and very different.

Fundamentally, though, what we are dealing with, just as we heard with Loretto and Morrison's, is of cultures of naivety and assumption that everything would be all right because these things wouldn't happen. That is no way to run a school. Undoubtedly things have been improving in all the schools since the 1990s, though at different speeds, and I entirely recognise that that point is taken on board and was taken on board, though at different speeds, by all three schools.

Things were beginning to change in the early 1990s and we saw that at Loretto with the complaint of

Mr Stock and in the same way at QVS with the comparable complaint from Mr Harrison. What is different perhaps is QVS actually responded very well, led by the Commissioners, who gripped, to use the word of management, the problem, bringing in inspectors,

bringing in police and trying to change, as distinct, perhaps, from the approach taken at Loretto, which we may hear about a little bit more tomorrow.

QVS recognised the merit of external eyes to ascertain if there was merit or not in the complaint, so it's clear by 1991 at least there was a sea change beginning there. It's interesting that one of the common themes we've heard from some very impressive former heads and current heads is that inspection is something positive to be welcomed. It's part of the growth mindset. These are professionals who know what they're talking about and can help. It is not about trying to paper over any cracks.

In that regard, I do recognise, with gratitude, some of the evidence we heard of very progressive leadership skills, particularly at Gordonstoun, thinking of both Mark Pyper and his successor, Simon Reid, which obviously in terms of Lisa Kerr now provided a very sound foundation and introduced very profound change. That may have not been so obvious in some of the other former heads we heard of, but it is an indication, if nothing else, of the need for strong, compassionate, intelligent leadership, which, when it's present, has a very significant change for the better and is something that should be considered by all schools

looking to the future.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In that regard, I should commend all three schools who have been dealt with in this session for their positive, helpful and serious approach to the Inquiry. As I've noted, heads, Chairs of Boards, Commissioners, and with QVS Colonel Knightley, followed closely, thoughtfully, and I would suggest gave compelling and helpful evidence in the round-up sessions. It's reflected very well in the submissions where there is no challenge to the evidence, but a recognition that they must always try to do better. There's also been a recognition of a need for a culture of openness, particularly as regards reporting and employment issues, which will be helpful later on when the Inquiry process progressing to written findings. There's also recognition of the need for outside guidance, the potential benefits again of the LADO system or sensible local connections with police and social work. All useful for our purpose looking to the future.

As I recognise again, it's no doubt clear that real change in cultures has already been effected: much greater reporting, the bespoke and intelligent systems of reporting, as well as a recognition that one can never be complacent and assume things will not happen.

That's one of the fundamental sea changes which matters.

And of course that was emphasised by two recent instances of sexual abuse at QVS, or connected with QVS. One was obviously out of the school at home and had been going on for decades. What is striking is under both regimes, there was an assumption that systems were in place which would prevent it; they didn't.

It is also striking how the recent case was well-handled, and in many ways is a model of how schools should respond, telling everyone instantly.

LADY SMITH: Yes. It was helpful to hear about that recent experience.

MR BROWN: Yes.

LADY SMITH: But also going back to the dangers of assumption, I suppose what is striking about that is that of course the schools have been seeking to act in good faith. Nobody has ever suggested that any of them were in bad faith so far as the systems they had for children were concerned or the lack thereof, but in so many cases what led them to fail was them starting with always wanting things to be right for the children and assuming that they were and would be right for the children without critically examining what the basis for their assumptions were and whether they were safe assumption to make.

MR BROWN: Indeed so. And what was encouraging, just as

with Loretto, who went through the same process very 1 shortly or in fact during the Inquiry --2 LADY SMITH: Yes. 3 MR BROWN: -- it makes the point there is no room for 4 5 complacency, there is no room for assumption, but 6 systems can be in place which can pick up when this 7 happens and lead to an entirely appropriate response, 8 which is open and progressive, and again it's striking 9 with QVS, a lessons-learned mentality, taking it forward, thinking progressively. Because, to close with 10 11 some repetition, what we have heard in the last four 12 weeks is the horror of assumption and complacency, and 13 we have heard from applicants so, so powerfully of the harm that that caused and is to be hoped that by this 14 15 chapter, and also moving on to Fettes in due course, we 16 will find common themes that can improve the lot of 17 pupils in the future. LADY SMITH: Thank you very much, Mr Brown. 18 Can I now turn to the submissions for Gordonstoun? 19 Closing submissions by Mr Dunlop QC 20 MR DUNLOP: My Lady, I'm obliged. Scars have the strange 21 power to remind us that our past is real, so wrote 22

Cormac McCarthy. Gordonstoun bears the scars of its

past. They have been felt all too keenly during this

Inquiry. The school is grateful for the opportunity to

23

24

25

participate, to listen and to learn, and that being so, it is, I'm sure, of no surprise to your Ladyship that the school offers no challenge to the credibility of the former pupils who have testified.

On the contrary, the school is content that the Inquiry accepts the testimony of the former pupils who have spoken.

The principal, Lisa Kerr, members of the school's leadership and alumni support teams, David White, the chair of the Board of Governors, attended every day of the evidence in phase two to acknowledge and to listen to those who came to give evidence and what they had to say.

As Ms Kerr said so memorably in her testimony, addressing all those who have testified to your Ladyship, they have been heard.

As was said in the school's opening statement, the contrast between the school of today and the school of the past could not be greater. The school wishes to assure your Ladyship and indeed all those who gave evidence that Gordonstoun continues to listen, to develop and to respond to ensure the safety and the well-being of all of its pupils. This is so that the lessons from the past can demonstrably be learned and implemented, as I hope is clear they have been over

recent years.

In line with that, the school wishes to offer its sincere thanks to those who have come forward to assist the Inquiry. Their testimony was brave and compelling. At times it was difficult to listen to. What was heard was far removed from the principles of the school's founder, Kurt Hahn, where challenge, adventure, service and, above all, compassion, are key. Those who love the school, present throughout this stage of the Inquiry, were moved by what they heard, sometimes to tears. They are determined that the scars of which I have spoken should not be forgotten nor concealed. They should be acknowledged and understood so that the deeply regrettable events of the past are never again repeated.

Equally the school would not want the various positive aspects of the testimonies to be overshadowed by those less edifying.

The school would respectfully suggest that the evidence led before the Inquiry usefully breaks down into six areas, which I'll perhaps take in turn.

The first is Aberlour House. As set out in the opening statement, Gordonstoun was founded in 1934 by visionary educationalist Kurt Hahn. He also founded a small prep school, Wester Elchies, in 1936 and that school relocated to and became known as Aberlour House

in 1947. Although they share a founder, Gordonstoun and Aberlour operated as separate schools until 1999 when Aberlour House became a subsidiary of Gordonstoun. This was a precursor to the formal closure of Aberlour House in 2004 and a move to the Gordonstoun campus.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Before 1999, Aberlour House had its own board, its own headmaster, and whilst many students went on to Gordonstoun from Aberlour, the relationship between the two was informal, although strong.

The company that ran Aberlour House was recently restored to the Companies House register in order that it, or rather its insurers, might deal with claims relating to abuse there. Professor Brian Williams, a former governor at Aberlour House, has provided in writing a fulsome apology received into evidence during the course of the testimony of Ms Kerr. The legal demarcation between the entities is, or at least was pre-1999, clear but perhaps rather beside the point. The true point is that addressed by Ms Kerr in her opening: some, mercifully few, children suffered whilst at Aberlour House. The entity that ran the school then exists now only as a vehicle to handle claims. It has no heart and it has no soul. Gordonstoun has a heart. Gordonstoun has a soul. And it offers once more its deepest sympathy to those who suffered abuse at

Aberlour.

My Lady, the second matter that I have to address is abuse by staff.

Gordonstoun took a proactive approach from the outset of this Inquiry informing your Ladyship of every instance and example it could find that might come under the heading of abuse. No stone has been left unturned by the school, and on the basis of the evidence heard the Inquiry will rightly be concerned at the actions of some of the staff who, it would seem, acted reprehensibly in circumstances in which their behaviour was appalling and caused lasting damage.

It is of ongoing concern to the school that such cases were not detected or stopped at the time. It is acknowledged that the evidence suggested that there was a culture of not telling, or telling but not being believed, which prevailed at the time. The Inquiry heard a number of examples of abuse by staff at Aberlour House and also at Gordonstoun.

In particular, the Inquiry heard evidence of examples of serious abuse, primarily at Aberlour House but also at Gordonstoun. I'm going to address some specific examples, but in doing so, I should not be taken as suggesting in any way that the problems were limited to those examples. As has been recognised

already, the school has been careful to ensure the

Inquiry has been made aware of all allegations of abuse
which have been made known to the school.

The Inquiry heard that Derek Jones, now deceased, abused John Findlay at Aberlour House. This clearly and understandably had a lasting impact on Mr Findlay and yet remarkably, Mr Findlay, who went on to Gordonstoun after Aberlour House, equally clearly retains a deep-seated respect for and fondness of Gordonstoun. He and other witnesses accepted that the school of today has moved a long way from his experiences, to the extent that he would, without hesitation, send his own children there.

A matter of concern is the fact that there were contemporaneous allegations of Jones' behaviour at least in part. It was said by John Findlay that his parents were assured that Jones would not teach again, and yet he did in England and then in Kenya. That this was allowed to happen might be said to be symptomatic of the culture at the time at schools from whom your Ladyship has heard already, perhaps in society in general, of not wishing to discuss matters that are difficult or awkward or embarrassing and where there was a culture of not telling tales amongst the pupils, it would not be unfair to say that this pervaded into the culture of the staff

- 1 at the time.
- 2 LADY SMITH: It's interesting that you refer to it being
- difficult for people to discuss having been abused.
- 4 A phrase used by an applicant in a previous case study
- 5 was, "When I was a child, I didn't have the lexicon for
- 6 it".
- 7 MR DUNLOP: Absolutely.
- 8 LADY SMITH: He's so right and he speaks for so many people
- 9 in that respect.
- 10 MR DUNLOP: He does.
- 11 LADY SMITH: Children find it very, very hard to explain
- 12 what's going on. They can't find the words to do so.
- MR DUNLOP: And that is why, as we'll come onto, innovations
- such as well-being watchers are so important because
- they enable children, they give children the power to
- 16 make those revelations where necessary.
- 17 LADY SMITH: Yes.
- MR DUNLOP: It's perhaps unclear from the available evidence
- of exactly how it happened, and despite the initial
- involvement of the police, but Jones was allowed to
- 21 leave and to leave quietly and ultimately did go on to
- teach elsewhere. My Lady, this is something that should
- not have happened. There is no equivocation about that
- and there is simply no way it would be allowed to happen
- 25 at the Gordonstoun of today. This is, after all, the

school that has pioneered mandatory reporting as a cornerstone of safeguarding children.

DKX was not a teacher, but he was allowed to work at Aberlour House. Precisely how that came about is also unclear, but however it came about, it is clear from the evidence of the former deputy headmaster, Mr Hanson, that even in the past a male member of staff sharing a tent along with female pupils should never have happened. But it did happen, and as a result, 'Sarah' told the Inquiry she was raped while on a camping trip. Hers is a good example of testimony that was so difficult to listen to. She was on an event that should have been fun and it ended in a brutal loss of innocence.

The evidence of 'James' was read into the evidence and described the regular abuse he suffered while at Aberlour House in the hands of a teacher, KME. He indicated that the scars of this followed him to Gordonstoun. James said he never told anyone about what was happening to him, perhaps indicative of the very point Your Ladyship has just made.

Andrew Keir was employed as a teacher at

Gordonstoun. He's been convicted of lewd acts and

indecent assault involving boys at Gordonstoun, some of

whom gave evidence to this Inquiry. Mr Keir also

testified and continues to protest his innocence. The school does not support his protestations. His convictions are clear and at least for some of them are admitted as reflecting the actuality. Mr Keir is, by his own confession, a paedophile. The safety checks adopted at Gordonstoun, indeed in education as a whole in the 1970s and 1980s, were not such as to allow this to be recognised or stopped before it was too late. The changes in systems since then, as I will come onto, are such that it is hoped and believed that this would not happen now.

By orders of magnitude less serious but still requiring to be addressed are the actions of EXL, whose approach to discipline would not only be completely unacceptable today, but was also so out of step with the school at the time that it led to his departure from the school. His evidence in the statement read to the Inquiry regrettably seems to lack insight as to this, even as at today's date. For the avoidance of doubt, the school does not lack such insight.

The third aspect, my Lady, and perhaps following on logically, is peer-to-peer abuse, and it is, in hindsight, regrettably clear that there was a material deficiency in the supervision of pupils in the 1970s and the 1980s. The laudable concept of autonomy embodied in

the trust system was allowed to develop into a situation in which some pupils became, to adopt CCN's description, feral. Whilst many former pupils clearly blossomed in this environment, for some it was actively harmful in exposing them to unchecked bullying. Some of the evidence was, frankly, harrowing.

Such systems as in place were largely dependent on who was housemaster at the material time, but the evidence of 'Duncan' and Dr Mann clearly demonstrates that the approach was wholly inadequate. The evidence of the latter also speaks to a tolerance of racism which simply would not be tolerated now and which is deeply regretted.

The fourth aspect that I'd like to address is really just an overview of the school before the introduction of Mr Pyper. The school acknowledges that its systems were lacking, did not allow for adequate supervision of pupils, adequate vetting of staff or adequate provision for staff going on elsewhere. This has again, with hindsight, led to the difficulties already adverted to in the form of abusive staff and pupils.

Notwithstanding that, my Lady, it is, in my submission, clear that many pupils enjoyed a fulfilling and rewarding education at Gordonstoun. Multiple positive testimonies have been volunteered and I know

they will not be ignored by the Inquiry. Even during an era where other students spoke of severe bullying, many described Gordonstoun as life-enhancing, even life-saving because of the refuge it provided from a destructive home life; and others, examples of whom are given, all offered positive testimony of their time at the school.

The philosophies of Kurt Hahn, when carried out properly and under proper supervision, lead to a rewarding education. That even through the travails of the 1970s and 1980s so many pupils still speak positively of the school is something that is a source of pride and some balm against the shame and the regret occasioned by the other evidence.

It suggests that such peer-on-peer abuse as was perpetrated at the school, whilst deeply regrettable and deeply regretted, was targeted and appeared to be linked to particular houses rather than endemic across the whole school.

The fifth aspect, my Lady, that I'd like to touch on is the change that was signalled by Mr Pyper's introduction as head, and that, of course, came in 1990 and heralded what, in my submission, can be seen to be a continuous course of improvement with the appointment of Mr Pyper as headmaster. It's not pretended for

a second that his introduction saw the immediate cure of 1 2 all previous ills. Mr Pyper recognises that himself. But it did usher in a new way of thinking in which 3 planned improvement and pastoral care were given 4 5 a prominence that had been lacking in the previous era. 6 Kindness became the pre-eminent virtue promoted to 7 children. Recruitment policies were changed, staff being properly vetted, trained, supervised. Physical 8 9 punishments were removed. LADY SMITH: Regarding kindness as the key, the pre-eminent 10 11 virtue, as you put it, is very interesting to me. One 12 hears in other contexts of the need to love all children 13 in care, whether it's boarding school care or other residential institutions, which may be thought to be not 14 15 right. You cannot mandate that an adult loves somebody 16 else's child. However, you can mandate, I think, that people should be kind to other people's children. 17 MR DUNLOP: Absolutely. 18 LADY SMITH: It's not that difficult a skill to learn. 19 MR DUNLOP: It should not be. Anyone going into education 20 21 should have that at their core. My Lady, that is the ethos of Gordonstoun and that, in my submission, is the 22 23 ethos that should be accepted by this Inquiry. LADY SMITH: And maybe it has to be said openly. It's 24

25

recognised that it can be very difficult to love

children that are not your own, and indeed that could lead to uneven treatment of children, favouritism of some children and not others, that's not what it's about, but kindness as an aspect of mutual respect where children are concerned and caring about their well-being in a kind way.

MR DUNLOP: Precisely. In my submission, respect and kindness should be seen as two sides of the same coin.

They go hand in hand. They are essential one for the other and vice versa.

Perhaps the change signalled by Mr Pyper's introduction is seen most clearly in the speech that he delivered within a week of taking position as head. Your Ladyship heard that speech was met initially with resistance, but he persisted and he introduced many vital improvements. On his own evidence, these took five or six years to have an effect, but that effect was palpable. His innovations saw the change from an environment where behaviour was not subject to sufficient safeguards to the school that exists today, one where the safety and well-being of every child is the paramount concern.

Even then, even during Mr Pyper's reign, it is accepted there were pupils -- this was when Keir was active -- it is very clear that the vetting of Keir was

Nevertheless, a new morality and ethical code was introduced to the school, staff and pupils alike, such that early in his tenure Mr Pyper was confident that ill-treatment or abuse of a child would have been very difficult to conceal at the school. Mr Keir would not have been able, in let's say 2011, to get away with how he had behaved 20 years previously. Even if incidents of bullying were not, as they can never be, fully

inadequate, as was the supervision of him.

permitted.

It is suggested that the Inquiry may feel that the sea change marked by the appointment of Mr Pyper was well described in the compelling testimony of Diana Monteith. That improvement then, as I think is recognised by my learned friend, continued with the introduction of Simon Reid and now Lisa Kerr. Mr Reid introduced the well-being information system that has been the cornerstone of pupil protection at Gordonstoun ever since. He also introduced mandatory reporting requirements into every staff contract, stipulating that failure to report a suspicion of abuse would constitute gross misconduct and could therefore lead to summary

eradicated, the bullying culture of the 1970s and 1980s

became a thing of the past, something to be recognised

and guarded against, but never again to be tolerated or

dismissal.

The Inquiry can be satisfied, in my submission, beyond any doubt of the commitment of Ms Kerr and the current board to ensure that in leading the continual improvement of care, delivering the very highest educational standards, they also take care to learn from the mistakes of the past. This can be seen from the school's early work with NSPCC, Mandate Now, Barnado's, and most especially with CELCIS. As the Inquiry has heard, the school was unique in engaging with CELCIS with a view to understanding how to support survivors of abuse and with a view to reassuring them of improved standards in pupil protection.

The school will continue openly to engage with alumni and with organisations such as CELCIS about the past and it encourages other schools to do the same.

Finally, my Lady, the question of lessons learned.

Following 30 years of changes and improvements, which have included transformed societal attitudes, new legislative and regulatory regimes and revolutionised approaches to care and education through a recognition of the need for planned care and quality assurance, modern boarding schools such as Gordonstoun are safe and nurturing places. Children in such schools benefit from support and care, which connects their academic learning

with out-of-classroom experiences such as sport, the arts and adventure. They have their parents plus a whole network of school staff who get to know them better than is possible in other settings where time is more limited.

That being so, my Lady, children at Gordonstoun today are happy and love boarding. It would be a tragedy if the failings of the past meant that the many rewards and positives of boarding experienced by children went unrecognised by this Inquiry. Boarding gives an opportunity for them to learn the value of human diversity, by living and learning alongside people from all around the world and to have unique curricular experiences which challenge and excite them. They also have loving and connected relationships with their parents, family time is more special because school does much of the heavy lifting of the teenage years.

Modern boarding is not about sending a child away.

It's an active and positive choice.

In earlier parts of the Inquiry, it has been asked whether one-to-one interaction between staff and students might be considered inappropriate. This is not something with which Gordonstoun agrees. Effective pastoral care through all of the complexities of teenage life requires that interaction. Staff operate in loco

parentis and parenting cannot be done by committee.

Of course that means that stringent vetting, supervision and training of staff, which schools like Gordonstoun have in place, is so important, but one-to-one interaction is as well.

As part of the changes seen over this period, record-keeping has been transformed. The school has fully organised the thousands of student files in its archive, digitisation is an ongoing project, electronic well-being files were introduced in 2013.

The priorities of the current leadership at the school are built around three key principles: continual improvement, a relentless commitment to doing better through self-evaluation, planning and reflection, quality assurance, knowing, not just trusting, that the right things are happening through systematic checks.

That is perhaps the key difference between knowing and not just assuming, because the danger of assumption, reflected by counsel to the Inquiry, is one that is all too clear, from what we've heard. And sustainability, ensuring that staff have the support, systems and resources they need to make the improvements and to assure quality.

In 2018 a robust annual questionnaire was introduced, asking parents, pupils and staff about

a huge range of issues at the school. The results contribute to a cycle of continual improvement, such that when Education Scotland inspected the school in 2019, the survey was described as the first that Education Scotland felt comfortable to use as part of their findings about a school precisely because it is so robust. The survey shows the triangulation of views across key stakeholder groups. The results in 2018 were extremely positive and have been improving ever since.

The pastoral section is designed around the SHANARRI well-being indicators, and the current section links into How Good Is Our School inspection framework.

The effective use by staff of the bespoke well-being information system is a key way in which the school keeps children safe and thus one reason why its pastoral care is consistently rated as sector-leading. This is a custom-built addition to the school's management information system, iSAMS, which allows careful sharing of vital information and for dots to be joined across different parts of children's lives. The system means that those in a position of responsibility have a real-time dashboard of pupil well-being.

Of course an IT system in and of itself does not keep children safe, but the extraordinary level of work involved in caring for young people can be facilitated

by good and efficient systems, ideally with quality assurance and record-keeping built in.

The school's pastoral teams are well-trained and organised. Meetings happen vertically and horizontally. The networks are an important part of the quality assurance process. They enable the sharing of best practice and safeguarding developments.

Pastoral staffing has been made more sustainable through recent management restructuring, which amongst other improvements introduced the roles of assistant head well-being, assistant head boarding. In houses, in addition to a resident houseparent, an assistant houseparent and a matron, recent staffing increases now mean that every house now also has a resident tutor or a second matron.

The school is currently developing a behaviour management framework which will incorporate more restorative approaches. The staff understand their role as educators. Their imperative is to teach young people how to do well and how to restore things when they get it wrong, focusing on the three principles of educate, repair, sanction where necessary.

Other recent developments within the school include empowering students by placing them at the heart of creating a positive culture. By way of example, and

I mentioned this earlier, a group of over 30 students across the school have been designated well-being watchers, whose role is to support pupil well-being, signpost staff and professional support, they are trained in confidentiality, active listening, body language, they understand safe spaces. They're fully trained in dialogue and initiative, shared with schools around the UK, teaching young people to learn to listen to each other, to build mutual understanding, to give them that lexicon that your Ladyship mentioned earlier. The well-being watchers meet weekly with younger students and their doors are marked to indicate where help may be found.

Likewise, the student well-being committee is of central importance at the school, running things like World Mental Health Day activities.

My Lady, safeguarding and child protection are unrecognisable today when compared to what existed in the 1970s and 1980s, when the abuse which dominated the evidence heard by this Inquiry took place. Even the concept introduced in the 1990s, of which Gordonstoun was an early adopter, of having a sole CPO is now outdated. Safeguarding the actions which are taken to prevent children suffering harm is the responsibility of everyone in a school. Gordonstoun trains every single

member of staff in how to keep children safe, refreshers are provided, updates are given. The extensive pastoral leadership team is, as one would expect, especially knowledgeable and always developing its learning.

Child protection is similarly transformed at

Gordonstoun with a child protection lead in the senior

school, another in the junior. Other members of the

team are trained to level four and the school continues

to increase the number of pastoral staff trained to this

highest level.

The school has recently enhanced the role of the tutor, so that this adult, usually a teacher, sits at the centre of each child's care and education. Tutors are organised by house and key stage in terms of education and development.

Each child has a tutor houseparent, assistant houseparent, matron, resident tutor or house assistant, in addition to which they can speak to school counsellors, the chaplain, pastoral assistant heads and the like.

There is simply a huge range of people who know and can support the pupils. The aim, and it's an aim which is actively pursued, is that every child has at least one member of staff with whom they can form a trusted connection.

In calling for written evidence, the Inquiry will have read many inspection reports of Gordonstoun recognising the high standards. These are the result of in-depth visits from expert teams of inspectors, who have free reign to go anywhere. These visits are welcomed, as has been recognised. The school is rightly proud that the dedication and professionalism of staff led to Education Scotland's most recent report describing pastoral care and child protection as sector leading and outstanding and other schools are pointed towards Gordonstoun as an exemplar of best practice.

Most recently, Gordonstoun was awarded UK's best independent boarding school award for its work on post-Covid mental health recovery.

My Lady, in closing, the school is not complacent.

No school environment will ever be perfect nor will it be risk-free but the Inquiry can be satisfied that the failings of the past have been understood and addressed. The school is proud of and committed to the unique educational ethos of its founder. It is run by dedicated people for whom child safety and well-being is at the heart of every action they take.

The school reiterates the pain experienced by those now at the helm in hearing how things went wrong in the past. It reiterates its sorrow for those who have

suffered from past failings but it recalls the words of Ms Kerr once more: they have been heard. The Gordonstoun of today is unrecognisable from that described in the more concerning chapters. It is a school that embraces the positive aspects of the ethos of its founder and allows that ethos to be furthered in a caring, nurturing and safe environment where every pupil is empowered, respected and protected.

It has, as it is hoped is recognised, engaged fully and positively with the Inquiry. It reiterates its offer to give the Inquiry access to the school itself or to the well-being system to see how things operate now. Happy empowered pupils are the beating heart of Gordonstoun today. Dedicated professional staff are its soul.

If our scars have the power to remind us that the past is real, those scars, my Lady, have been explored in detail by this Inquiry, whose scrutiny is vital and is welcomed. The Inquiry has the assurance that Gordonstoun will not forget the scars of its past, nor will it allow the wounds that inflicted those scars to recur.

I'm obliged.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much for that.

Well, as I indicated at the opening today, I will

1	rise now for the two-minute silence and take the morning
2	break, and then I'll return after that to hear the
3	Queen Victoria School's submissions. Thank you.
4	(10.59 am)
5	(A short break)
6	(11.22 am)
7	Closing submissions by Mr MacIver
8	LADY SMITH: Mr MacIver, thank you for anticipating what
9	might be most helpful to the stenographers, that's very
_0	helpful.
.1	MR MACIVER: Yes, my Lady.
_2	First of all, my apologies. I took the view that
_3	the risk of my voice giving out was worth going to get
_4	more water, so here I am.
.5	LADY SMITH: I hope you didn't feel you were doing the walk
_6	of shame. That's absolutely fine, Mr MacIver. Now,
_7	whenever you're ready, I'm ready to hear what you have
8_8	to say about QVS.
_9	MR MACIVER: I'm obliged, my Lady.
20	The first thing QVS would wish to emphasise is its
21	gratitude to the former pupils who have come forward to
22	assist the Inquiry. In his evidence on 31 March,
23	headmaster Donald Shaw closed by recognising the bravery
24	of those who have given accounts to the Inquiry and his

profound apologies to those who have been affected by

abuse. He stated that even one case of abuse is too
many. QVS wishes to emphasise that that is not mere
words.

Regardless of any progress made since or positive testimony from those who enjoyed all or part of their time at the school, any and every incidence of abuse of a child who should have been able to count on QVS as a place of safety is a stain on the institution that cannot be washed clean.

At the close of his evidence on 27 October, Colonel Clive Knightley, who is an experienced former army officer and now of course deputy head of the Armed Forces Families and Safeguarding Unit described his experience of listening to the testimony of survivors -- LADY SMITH: Mr MacIver, everything you say is really important. Could I invite you to slow down a little and make sure the microphone is in the best position that it can be in.

19 MR MACIVER: I'm obliged, my Lady.

LADY SMITH: Yes, that's it. Thank you.

MR MACIVER: Colonel Knightley described his experience of listening to the testimony of survivors over the previous six days as upsetting, verging on harrowing.

That discomfort is itself nothing as set against the

lived experience of those who suffered and QVS

recognises that. The Inquiry can be assured that it represents a genuine reaction of horror of those at QVS and within the MoD on hearing these first-hand accounts of failures occurring on its watch.

QVS and MoD are proud of the history and the present providing education to those with Scottish connections in the Armed Forces but they're not proud of the history heard by the Inquiry. The incidents of excessive discipline often used as a pretext for bullying, sexual abuse, of neglect, of peer-on-peer abuse, of a culture of silence and of emotional abuse, QVS is ashamed that those happened and is sorry to each and every pupil, to those who came forward and to any who have not yet come forward.

One systemic failure which is a particular source of shame is the culture of silence which for far too long appears to have reigned at the school. Donald Shaw described it in his evidence as appalling that reporting of abuse and ill-treatment was discouraged for so long. That word is not too strong. From that breach, so much flowed. Children who should have been supported in a safe environment felt unable to report what they were suffering and feared consequences if they were to do so. They found themselves isolated at precisely the time when they were most in need of support. That was wrong

and QVS apologises to all of them.

My intention is to address the Inquiry in three broad chapters today. Firstly I want to address the evidence around the school until the early 1990s; secondly, as part of an evident cultural change around that time, to address the evidence separately around the school between the 1990s and the period covered by the Inquiry, the end of that period; and thirdly to try and identify useful lessons and practices which can be drawn from the experience of QVS as it stands today.

So firstly the school to the 1990s.

It's clear throughout this phase of the Inquiry that the 1990s have represented a change in the national culture around boarding schools and around schooling more generally. Child safeguarding and child protection were starting to come to the fore and the picture from the evidence around QVS is of a culture and practice continually growing and improving in those areas ever since.

QVS is as responsible for the experience of those entrusted to it long ago as to those in its care today, a it's transitioned from an all-boys' establishment with a stronger military focus to the current co-educational school of today that provides a broad education to those with parents in the Forces. It's important to draw out

and face up to the themes emerging from the accounts given to the Inquiry.

The first of those themes is discipline. Those speaking to the period before 1970 all described a regime of harsh discipline, and corporal punishment is and remained a theme in all of the accounts of the periods prior to its abolition. 'Bob' described a teacher who overpunished to the extent that his father felt compelled to come to the school to intervene himself. 'Andrew' spoke to excessive physical punishment by staff. 'Andy' gave an account of physical punishment being used by a teacher for poor academic performance. 'Bob' spoke to a particular individual who slathered at the prospect of meting out punishment. All of this behaviour was entirely inappropriate regardless of whatever social standards may have been at the time.

The pupils attending in the 1970s and 1980s speak also to physical punishment. Both 'Alex' and 'Ann' described a teacher notorious for throwing a wooden duster at the heads of pupils and, concerningly, this was described as being well known amongst staff.

'Martin' spoke to punishment for poor academic performance. 'Joe's' view was of punishment which reflected the standards of the time. 'James' spoke to excessive punishment by staff, including practices of

blitz periods and punishment for bed-wetting.

The second perhaps related theme is pupil-to-pupil punishment. There's evidence of this taking on a physical form. This practice does not appear to have been an official one, but something which rose among pupils themselves as a means of enforcing school standards. It features in the evidence of 'Alex', and 'Joe' describes the practice getting out of hand among the younger pupils in taking on grotesque forms. It is to be regretted that this ever took place in the school.

The official route for discipline by pupils involved and still involves the issuing of days. It's concerning that 'Peter', when speaking to the 1990s, recalls an arbitrary non-accountable system of prefects issuing laps and cleaning duties, sometimes repeatedly. It's to be emphasised that the modern practice which continues in QVS bears little resemblance to that.

Donald Shaw spoke to a transparent sanction system used relatively infrequently and limited to prefects referring students to staff for 'a day', which involves helping at meal times in public and under close supervision by the staff. It's submitted that this represents a positive example of softening what had been a harsh and unwelcome practice and making sure that it remains under control while maintaining the utility of

having prefect participation in the discipline system.

To update the point, practice does remain under active review and Mr Shaw has found it notable in his discussions that in fact there is wide student support for it.

The third theme is bullying. The experience of pre-1970s pupils does vary in that it does not feature as a major theme in the evidence of 'Andrew' and 'Bob' but for 'Andy' and 'Ann' very serious bullying episodes do feature despite the measures describes by 'Andy' to counter this.

Later pupils, however, do speak consistently to bullying. In the 1970s 'Joe' spoke to hazing and severe episodes of mental bullying. 'Alex's' account of being seriously bullied for having reported abuse is especially distressing. The importance of reporting is something which features heavily in QVS's modern ethos and it's very concerning indeed to hear an account so contrary to today's practices.

Pupils in the 1980s speak to bullying among pupils amplified by a culture of non-reporting. 'Martin' spoke to that. 'Clifton' spoke to the bullying of a bed-wetter. 'James' spoke to a violent culture among pupils, amplified by emotional bullying and by a culture of non-reporting. 'Keith', by contrast, spoke to

a single incident which he managed to have successfully 1 resolved.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Moving into the 1990s, three of the pupils speaking to that period disagreed with the suggestion that the culture at that point was one of bullying.

However, fourthly, emotional abuse, and this is considered appropriate to emphasise as a theme worthy of attention in its own right as a matter both part of and separate to the broader theme of bullying.

The accounts of bullying mentioned above do focus on physical mistreatment, but it's also clear from them that that by its very nature brings with it emotional distress for those concerned. It's notable that most of the former pupils who gave evidence in person did speak to what would be recognised now as emotional abuse as part of their time at the school and about continuing to suffer from emotional consequences in their later lives.

LADY SMITH: As you're probably aware, Mr MacIver, I've heard time and again from people, now adults, seeking to emphasise how sometimes emotional abuse is the hardest thing to suffer. If they had a choice, terrible choice to have, but if they had a choice, they would accept physical rather than emotional, for example.

MR MACIVER: Yes. And it's notable from those witnesses that in many cases it's not simply saying this, but

exhibiting it in how they gave evidence. 1

LADY SMITH: And creating a culture where day and daily the 2 child feels under that sort of abusive, emotional 3 abusive pressure.

MR MACIVER: Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It does appear that the worst aspects of emotional bullying may have been slower to be addressed than the physical forms. The distressing evidence of 'Felix', whose time at the school was in the early 1990s, stands as an extreme contrast to the more positive accounts which were starting to emerge in evidence from that period. His comment in response to a particular incident that nobody would have thought to tell the teacher is on its own a very sad one.

He spoke to having suffered from extreme physical and emotional bullying, to a culture of discouraging sneaking, as it was known at the school, culminating in his case in a suicide attempt and in his leaving the school.

Many of the themes in this part culminate in his evidence, and QVS acknowledges the experience and effect of all those incidents upon the pupils and reiterates how sorry it is to everyone whose time was tarnished in that way.

The fifth theme emerging was the sexual abuse by

Ben Philip. 'Joe', 'James' and 'Peter' had spoken to themselves having suffered abuse. 'Martin' spoke to Ben Philip as a known voyeur. These accounts are vivid and harrowing. QVS accepts the compelling nature and the sad consistency among them over a period of many years. The picture emerging is of a man determined to exploit his position and with the opportunity and the craft to do so and in plain sight where others remained oblivious. That's not said by way of mitigation. The significance of it lies in the warning that threats to children's well-being can arise from any source at any point. Indeed, it may well have been a conscious approach to portray a positive side to many people in order to maintain credibility as a trustworthy individual.

That's the structural challenge at the heart of a school's task, to be at all times alert, to look beyond the surface, to review the status quo for scope for exploitation. These matters highlight starkly the dangers around a culture of silence, allowing scope for grooming by a charismatic teacher and a lack of recognition by pupils of that grooming and abuse even at the time it was occurring. The evidence of James and his oblique attempts to report the abuse suffered by him stands as a further lesson for always being on watch for

issues which should be picked up and pursued.

These are clearly structural concerns which are as real today as they were in the past at the time when Ben Philip was at the school. Though QVS cannot change the past and acknowledges the pain of all those who gave evidence, it hopes that those who have suffered can draw some comfort from the fact that these concerns are uppermost in the priorities of the modern school and that there has been learning and progression in how such matters are dealt with.

A sixth theme is sexual abuse but by pupils themselves and incidents of this form are spoken to personally by 'Ann' and by 'Alex'. They've clearly had a significant and sad impact. In addition, 'Andrew' and 'Martin' spoke to having been aware of sexual abuse among pupils in their time at the school.

A seventh discrete theme is the culture of discouraging sneaking at the school. A culture of silence and a culture not sneaking sadly comes across very clearly through the pupil evidence. QVS is truly sorry that this was so. It can only have resulted in the missing of opportunities to tackle unacceptable behaviour. Accounts of pupils being actively discouraged from reporting abuse or being themselves sanctioned for reporting are among the most troubling

passages of all the evidence. It's hugely concerning that this theme, even more so a theme of staff awareness of the practice, recurs across virtually the whole period of the pupil evidence.

The culture was by no means unique to QVS and must be taken also as a reflection of where society may have stood at the time. Donald Shaw, in his own evidence, although having himself no involvement with boarding or the military in growing up, spoke in March about recognising the existence of cultures of silence from his own childhood far away. It may be that the Inquiry will have cause in the other phases to reflect upon harms caused by this.

The culture of silence was a notable target for improvement, where the greatest efforts to improve the school culture took place from the 1990s onwards.

Alice Hainey spoke to not having been aware of a military code in her time at the school, though

Evelyn Smith did mention this as part of her impression of QVS. Wendy Bellars spoke to having encouraged as a priority on her appointment a culture of openness and of pupil reporting concerns. Donald Shaw acknowledged her contribution towards that, which he has been enthusiastic in continuing to promote in this time.

To close this first chapter, the experience of

having been at QVS was not entirely negative in terms of preparation for life for some of those pupils who submitted statements. Others, however, relate significant impact on their later lives, particularly the emotional effects, the negative impacts on their families and on their subsequent relationships, and QVS is truly sorry to all of those whose lives were impacted as a result of those negative experiences among students.

QVS would like to thank Inquiry counsel for having done an excellent job in highlighting a past that was not known to many of those now involved with the school and giving the school an opportunity to demonstrate the many changes and improvements which have taken place since. One aspect of the evidence which might merit particular attention is the statement of Glenn Harrison, because it stands out in some contrast to the rest of the evidence, being partly a personal observation, with which no issue is taken, and indeed the Inquiry has already heard this morning that that served as something of a trigger for tackling the bullying culture during the early 1990s; but his evidence is also, in a greater part, speculation as to events which may have occurred off stage, as it were.

His own observations will, of course, form part of

the assessment undertaken by the Inquiry, but when it 1 2 comes to his views on things that might have occurred, for example, evenings out of the school, when he was not 3 present, it is submitted that the Inquiry ought simply 4 5 to set that part aside as speculation, inconsistent with 6 the rest of the evidence before it. I say that because 7 the matter was put to a number of pupils and there was 8 no real basis among their evidence for supporting the 9 impression that Mr Harrison had given in the speculative part of his evidence, and indeed they commented upon him 10 as being an unworldly figure who might be easily misled. 11 12

LADY SMITH: In conjunction with calling his evidence speculative in that respect, I suppose you can point to the fact that nowhere in his statement does he offer any direct evidence of having seen the activities that he is inferring took place as having taken place.

MR MACIVER: That's precisely it, my Lady.

LADY SMITH: He doesn't offer any specification of what he thinks actually took place.

MR MACIVER: No.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

21 LADY SMITH: It's quite murky.

MR MACIVER: The final point in the first chapter is to note is the unhappiness expressed by 'Ann' towards the end of her evidence that her contact with Donald Shaw, her initial contact with him in reporting what had happened

to her, had been shared more widely when she'd been under an impression that it would be kept confidential. QVS is very sorry that she's not content with how the school handled the matter, but in light of the seriousness of her account, which she has herself now shared with the Inquiry, QVS hopes that she can now at least accept why QVS took the decision to share more widely. Her contribution has been a valuable one and the school recognises the courage that it took from her to come forward.

Turning to my second chapter, the school since the 1990s.

The pupils who have come forward so far to give their evidence are speaking to periods up to the mid-1990s. Events since have shown that there's no room for complacency, and the fact that the Inquiry has before it evidence of other instances of abuse since then stretching almost up to the present day illustrates a strong theme of the evidence of Mr Shaw,

Colonel Knightley and Mr Plumtree, which is that no system is or can be perfect, and what is of crucial importance is to create a culture which is continually trying to improve with the welfare of the child or young person at the heart of it.

The Inquiry did hear that even recently children

have continued to suffer from abuse. It is for that reason, above all, the Inquiry's findings and recommendations will be of great use to informing and developing future practice and culture in boarding schools. QVS hopes that those former pupils who gave evidence, and others who may have followed the proceedings but have so far remained silent, may be able to draw some comfort from lessons which have been learnt.

The Inquiry has heard directly from some participants about several serious incidents during the period from the early 1990s. The incidents involving Grant and Mark illustrate abuse by staff of positions of trust. The incident involving concerned pupil-to-pupil abuse, and the incident involving Gerry Buchanan in 2016 illustrates serious deficiencies by leadership in their response to criminal admissions by a member of staff. The Inquiry's heard evidence and has ample material from QVS regarding those and their outcomes.

This last point is of some importance in demonstrating a key improvement in the culture of the school. In each case, there was police investigation into the conduct in question, relating to potential criminal consequences, coupled with a QVS/MoD

disciplinary action approach in terms of employment matters.

The history of those incidents has also shown a progression in improvement in how those matters were dealt with. A child raising a complaint now is believed; the complaint is investigated; the member of staff is suspended; disciplinary processes may follow.

In the Buchanan case, the Inquiry heard that the flawed process there itself gave rise to disciplinary proceedings against staff. QVS also recognises the difficulty posed by the reference and compromise agreement that came about at the end of Mark's case and would welcome the Inquiry's findings and recommendations on that issue.

One matter on which I might be able to bring the Inquiry up to date, which came too late to be reflected in the written submissions, is that those particular difficulties in relation to Mark's reference have been something which have been turned over in minds ever since that passage of evidence. This came to my attention too late for inclusion in written submissions, but QVS has identified the applicable MoD policy relating to references and that will be sent on to the Inquiry in due course.

LADY SMITH: Thank you. I'd like to see that.

MR MACIVER: For today's purposes, though, I think it would
be useful to inform the Inquiry that there is
a dedicated short passage within that policy relating to

QVS, and it might be appropriate if I simply read out
that at this point.

The policy itself dates from October 2020 and the short passage relating to QVS says that:

"If you are a teacher employed at QVS, references will normally be provided by your headteacher. In addition to providing details regarding your length of service and the nature of your employment, you can expect the reference to cover ..."

And there are five bullets:

"... your teaching experience; knowledge, understanding and skills; attendance; competence; and disciplinary record in relation to children."

It would not be appropriate for me to attempt to make any further comment today. For example, I don't know what preceded that policy or what else might be contained within it. It may be that QVS is able to address some relevant points with the Inquiry when sending on the policy to it.

A theme emerging from the 1990s is the development of a new culture within the school. It's been a feature of this phase of the Inquiry, as I noted, that a broader

shift across the culture nationwide had occurred during the 1990s such that openness, emotional intelligence and a focus on safeguarding the child came to the fore in a way that had not been the case previously.

At QVS, that manifested itself in a shift in emphasis from a physical culture which had existed before until then, being an all boys' school focusing on rugby and a probable career path, perhaps, into the military. Some of the martial trappings around the status of a military school do still remain, but the school has moved towards a culture with an emphasis on pastoral care and on child protection.

The evidence of Graeme Beattie provides a succinct overview of developments, given that he's been employed since 1984. He speaks to the school having always been a caring environment, but as he details his role through time, it's clear there's been a trend towards participation in pastoral care and GIRFEC, towards more formal monitoring and appraisal, and towards participation with individualised disciplines designed to cater to individual needs of each child.

The appointment of Alice Hainey as deputy
headteacher in 1992 with a special new responsibility
for pastoral care and well-being illustrates
a particular change at that time. It appears from her

account of her first days that pupils were well aware of the need for change, perhaps a result of the negative press coverage that had been very recent. She, however, speaks to the lack of an official complaints and reporting process at the time of her appointment, so although her impression was of an institution with no code of silence and where the pupils were happy, her reference to a deluge of complaints coming immediately is in itself an indication of the scale of what had to be done.

An important innovation which flowed from this was the trusted adult position and the initiation of child protection guidelines. The trend since then is towards ensuring pupils are listened to and staff being properly accountable, towards creating a space for voices to be heard and away from that culture of silence.

Evelyn Smith, who was appointed assistant head in 2002, described a rolling programme of renewing and developing various policies aimed at child welfare as well as training. Her evidence also illustrates a difficult element in the development of school culture whereby office politics can create feelings of mistrust among staff. She describes tensions over the treatment of \_\_\_\_\_\_. That case does illustrate that the school had moved away from overlooking and

minimising the complaints of children.

Wendy Bellars gave similar evidence about staff atmosphere at the time of her appointment as head teacher in 2007. She was clear about the reinforcement of focus on child protection during her time, including a number of important developments on that front, including safeguarding and child protection, and the development of committees to assist the operation of the Board of Commissioners and the interest taken by those, specifically in matters such as pastoral care. A "talk to someone" policy initiated in her time was designed to foster openness and she sought to move the culture towards one of respect. Illustration of this might be seen in the QVS child protection guidelines, a version of which are before the Inquiry.

It's notable from them that the definitions of abuse section has changed and expanded over that period.

Donald Shaw, in an exchange with your Ladyship,

acknowledged that the categories identified in the

current guidance may no longer be appropriate. To bring

the Inquiry up to date on that theme, these guidelines

are themselves now presently undergoing a review process

and a copy will be passed to the Inquiry once that is

complete.

Donald Shaw expressly acknowledges Ms Bellars' role

in having improved that aspect of the school during her tenure. He himself took over after her dismissal in 2016 and has instigated many positive developments which QVS believes place it in a good position to ensure that the risk of abuse to children is minimised and that the school embeds a proper growth mindset towards continual improvement going forward. These specific elements, given their recency, are addressed in the final section of these submissions.

The final theme from the 1990s is the move to co-education, and the introduction of the girls to QVS is perhaps the single biggest development in changing the culture around the school. Brian Raine, in his statement, described how the introduction of girls in 1996 was a major development requiring major changes in structure, accommodation and procedures, but also ethos, attitudes, sports and extracurricular activities. However, the benefits were obvious and enormous. It was easier for armed services families to educate their sons and daughters in one school. Holiday arrangements, weekends, parents' evenings and visits became much easier and convenient. The boys and girls grew up naturally with each other and, partly because of the number of siblings, got on well with each other and remained very good friends after school.

It's a change that QVS considers to have been an enormous success and QVS would like to put on record its view that the move itself was a major factor in contributing to the softening of the hard culture described in earlier accounts and would like to thank, in particular, the first generation of female students for their contributions towards that change.

The third and final chapter relates to the modern school. While QVS is conscious that the Inquiry's remit strictly does not run beyond December 2014, it does consider it would be helpful to share with the Inquiry some of the lessons learnt and practices developed under MoD oversight and being applied in the school as it stands today.

QVS is aware that the current policies and practices cannot be the final word on the matter. Donald Shaw and Colonel Clive Knightley stated in closing their evidence on 27 October: QVS recognises that it must aim at a culture of improvement, and that, were the Inquiry to reconvene in 2031, it would, it is hoped, find a culture which had improved significantly beyond the improvements which have bedded in up to today.

There can be no room for complacency. This is shown most uncomfortably for QVS by the fact that even during the course of the Inquiry QVS has seen a staff member

convicted for offences against children in the period to 2019. No system can ever be considered perfect, not least because those against whom it's guarding are engaged in trying to circumvent it, and QVS recognises the importance of vigilance, of humility, of continual review and of a growth mindset aimed always towards improvement in ensuring that the policies and practices followed are to be as robust as possible. Encountering an active case so recently is as stark a warning against complacency as could possibly be imagined.

With that in mind, QVS would like to set out
a number of principles and practices which it considers
might form a basis for the Inquiry's consideration of
whether recommendations might be made across schools
going forward.

Firstly, a bias towards reporting. The Inquiry heard of two incidents of criminal conduct by members of staff arising in 2016 and 2019. It's submitted that the 2019 incident represents a model response, but that's sharply in contrast to the serious failing in 2016, where the personal judgement of a staff member was employed to override candour being given to the appropriate authorities.

The Inquiry heard from Donald Shaw about the school's response on learning of the Clark case in 2019,

whereby all the appropriate bodies were informed on the day or at least within the next day. Mr Shaw described it as a response which was instinctive on his part and which in fact outstripped the school's policies. He describes the school's attitude as being concerned not about overreporting, as that because such incidents are mercifully relatively rare.

He also spoke to practical measures for encouraging reporting, as he put it, to make sure that "I knew there was something dodgy", that type of thought did not go unaired. QVS to that end has employed an anonymous intranet button as an instant trigger for a confidential and non-judgemental investigation to happen from the child protection co-ordinator who is now in place at the school.

The Buchanan case from 2016 stands in sharp and disappointing contrast. There, there was a confusion between protection and pastoral roles and to whom the latter might be owed, which led to a situation where important information was not reported when it should have been. The Inquiry has heard about the disciplinary procedures which ensued once that had come to light.

One issue is there was a suggestion in evidence around that case that data protection had been construed as a hindrance towards sharing information in the

circumstances. The Inquiry may wish to consider making a specific point that data protection is not a hindrance, and that should, perhaps, be a training point for any staff who are engaged in such matters.

QVS is also concerned that consideration given at the time of that incident to child welfare appeared to stop at the children within the school, for example, by taking care to examine the school IT equipment; the protection of children actually in the images did not appear to enter the equation when considering what the staff response ought to be in terms of disclosure.

A second theme which perhaps emerges from the 2019 case is in the engagement with the pupils and the scope for possible useful practices in this regard. Donald Shaw describes the engagement with Barnado's as part of the follow-up arising from the 2019 disclosure and using them as an additional means of support, coupled with immediate publicity among the parents, meaning that professional counselling was always on hand to the students.

Donald Shaw in particular spoke to his own personal discomfort at learning from the incident that, despite any efforts to advocate about risk, children may still not be able to recognise grooming and abuse when it's happening, and the risk of in-plain-sight abuse thereby

remains real. He considered there to be no alternative but to continually reinforce the message with children about what is acceptable adult behaviour and what is not.

The other side of the coin, and this was in response to your Ladyship's suggestion, was to agree with the importance that "not your fault" be front and centre when dealing with children as a message to avoid discouraging openness.

He also spoke to his ideas around a pupil-led discussion process as an option for development. This, in its way, also mirrors a practice already in place at the school of giving the child a voice, by having pupils engaged in any intervention-planning processes which arise in their own cases, although decision-making, of course, remains a matter reserved for adults.

A third theme is in staff-to-pupil contact. Mr Shaw in his evidence in March spoke at length on a strong emphasis being placed in QVS on managing staff contact with pupils. The accounts given by pupil witnesses as to visits to staff quarters are not reflective of today's QVS, where there's very little scope for children to enter staff quarters and never to do so unaccompanied.

LADY SMITH: It does seem pretty clear that the evidence

I've heard flags that up as being too risky to permit. 1 What about the Gordonstoun approach of saying that there 2 are occasions where one-to-one interaction between 3 a pupil and member of staff is critically important? 4 5 MR MACIVER: It's recognised that that's inherent in 6 education, and while the instinct might be to try to 7 eliminate any risks, there are risks which have to 8 remain in terms of education requires close contact 9 between adults and children. Sometimes that will be one to one, music lessons are a particular theme where that 10 11 might be required. What's important is that that be managed and the risk thereby minimised, and part of that 12 13 is, for example, in policy that this take place in public parts of the school only, with doors open and the 14 15 like, and certainly the avoidance of private situations 16 in private quarters is of critical importance.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR MACIVER: It is in the nature of a boarding school for there to be staff access to the boarding areas, but there is an understanding within QVS of the importance of pupil privacy, and Mr Shaw spoke to a "knocking and waiting" policy regarding entering bedroom areas.

A fourth theme relates to staff references. I've spoken about that already, and this may be an example where possible improvements to QVS's use of the

reference process is worthy of consideration. There is current consideration within QVS and within the MoD as to the extent of engagement of the headteacher with the recruitment process which currently undergoes a central sift. MoD are also considering an idea of doubling the reference process in order to have a dedicated and further safeguarding check at the application stage, such that it might be of use in spotting red flags in safeguarding's own right rather than running general checks and trusting that any safeguarding matters would be picked up by those.

There was a suggestion in Mr Shaw's evidence that there should be a very expansive approach towards references, seeking those at the application stage from all applicants, but the Inquiry may wish to note that at present the practice would be to obtain references from all candidates at interview stage, and of course there are practical difficulties in terms of simply attracting any applicants at all in insisting upon references at a very early stage, at which candidates may not wish their employers to know about those.

A further theme which is specific to QVS relates to its position within the MoD. The school having a unique position as being part of a much larger body means that it benefits from a wider MoD estate and a conscious push

towards child welfare issues there. In particular,

Colonel Knightley spoke to a recent restructuring within

the Ministry, leading to a renewed focus on safeguarding
and regular inspections.

The Inquiry, I believe, has already had passed to it one recent impact on QVS in that a safeguarding review took place in September of this year, and I understand that that's already been sent to the Inquiry.

The practical result of this wider expertise is the MoD effectively is acting as the Local Authority for QVS and as a source of advice and resources. Donald Shaw spoke to the MoD being a source of policy as much as any Local Authority would be for the schools in which he'd worked in his previous career. He also spoke to the Director of Children and Young People being active in dialogue of holding QVS to account and the benefits of that.

His personal view was against mandatory closer links to a local Local Authority, because that would bring with it costs of its own, though since the point's been raised, MoD have been giving that further consideration and considers that there might be some merit to using links with the Local Authority, which I think would be Stirling, as enhancing links to Scottish practices, in which MoD is conscious that it is not itself in

a position of expertise, the bulk of its estate lying elsewhere. It would not wish to rule out the utility of raising further and even more formal links with the relevant Local Authority.

It's come out as a strong theme from the evidence that good local and personal relationships are very important and are used positively by Mr Shaw, such as in his regular liaisons, informally, with local police.

I recall from previous schools that the centralisation of the police force had itself brought difficulties in establishing contacts, and QVS is happily not in that position.

The Local Authorities themselves participate in staff selection. QVS itself does adhere to the Scottish requirements, such as GIRFEC and the GTCS, and has always been keen to do so as part of its longstanding practice of trying to reflect changes across society more broadly.

The presence of MoD itself has a further important role because it is an active investigator when so required. In the scenarios described, its role as employer entails it complying with employment legislation while at the same time protecting children coming under its care. It is therefore compelled to a very thorough and measured approach when dealing with

cases and with reports of abuse, and it's recognised that that thorough process may inevitably be slow as a result.

A further theme particular to QVS relates to the Board of Commissioners. The Inquiry heard about QVS benefitting in its unique position from that relationship as in the Commissioners being an active and interventionist body providing another layer of oversight to the school. Alan Plumtree, in his evidence in March, described the existence of some safeguarding child protection input by individuals within the committee structure that was in place in 2006, but in the last three years or so, safeguarding and child protection functions have been allocated a committee of their own, such is their recognised importance.

Donald Shaw made the point that lead responsibility in those areas has always been understood to rest not with Commissioners but with the MoD and the DCYP, and the result is that there is now a multi-layering of supervision between the two, which is considered to work well. MoD now has ten certain committees of the Commissioners to avoid doubling the work, but the double layer of oversight remains. It's an accident of the structure, but it's a useful one and has been of benefit to QVS.

Mr Plumtree described Commissioners' visits to the school as being useful and working ones, not ceremonial, and emphasised that Commissioners' route of accountability is to the MoD as a whole. He eliminates any suggestions there might be that one service might be favouritised over another. He spoke to safeguarding as the Commissioners' conscious priority.

IT matters arose as a separate theme, and the
Inquiry heard about uses of IT in child protection, but
that IT itself brought with it difficult wider issues.
Broader privacy concerns around private equipment are
considered to limit scope for action. The Securly and
Google Alert systems are useful in generating alerts,
rapid action in the children's cases, but rely on use of
QVS equipment or software in order to operate. The
broader culture, however, is one of private mobile
technology raising issues around photos, around
bullying, which was recognised as an ever-increasing
tide by Ms Bellars early in her time as head. It may be
that this is an issue too large to be easily addressed
at this stage of the Inquiry.

LADY SMITH: Yes. Certainly on the evidence I've heard about the time frame I'm required to look at, abuse of children via messaging on mobile phones simply hasn't featured.

- 1 MR MACIVER: Yes.
- 2 LADY SMITH: Unsurprisingly --
- 3 MR MACIVER: Yes.
- 4 LADY SMITH: -- my end date being as it is. But I suppose
- 5 at a very high level it's something that I inevitably
- 6 have to have regard to as one looks forward to think
- 7 about systems that would have longevity and being aware
- 8 of new types of abuse emerging all the time. We've
- 9 certainly seen that during the period that I've been
- 10 examining.
- 11 MR MACIVER: That's exactly it. It's not even possible to
- 12 envisage what IT itself will bring with it as a thing in
- 13 18 months' or two years' time. It's an issue which has
- 14 potential concerns.
- 15 LADY SMITH: Mm-hmm.
- MR MACIVER: A more minor theme, perhaps, was the issue of
- 17 site security, which Donald Shaw spoke to as having
- 18 enhanced in his time. A clearer theme which emerged
- 19 from the evidence is related to vigilance, and the point
- 20 there being that despite the improvements detailed since
- 21 the 1990s, it has to be recognised and emphasised that
- scope for improvement remains and will always remain.
- No system can be perfect. It's in the nature of
- 24 safeguarding that one must remain vigilant and seek to
- 25 continually improve and to adapt to current

circumstances.

Mr Shaw and Colonel Knightley in a different context recognised that a culture of silence can persist, regardless of efforts to eradicate it. School houses might be an example of this within QVS.

One point is that where, while the broader culture has been rooted out, it's of some concern, with my lawyer's hat on, that Mr Shaw recorded a tendency of some pupils to have cited a right to silence as part of their attitude towards reporting, which he himself had to counter by repetition of his "report, report, report" message. The Inquiry might wish to consider whether the language of rights itself, as in a similar way to the proper perception of data protection that I alluded to earlier, that these misunderstandings might themselves risk creating a conflict with the culture of reporting.

So, to conclude, QVS very much appreciates the courage of those who have come forward to share their very personal experiences of life at the school and thanks them all for their reflections on what might have been done to make things better. It's allowed QVS to recognise, reflect on and learn from the size of the impact of these experiences on all of their lives. QVS regrets and apologises again to all who suffered negative experiences at the school. QVS in 2021 is

a better school, which continues to learn from their experiences.

Finally, QVS would also seek to emphasise that the offer that Donald Shaw made at the outset to pupils to visit the school and to contribute, if they could, and thereby perhaps to achieve for themselves a degree of closure was a real one, and it would be a privilege for him to seek to contribute to them in that way.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much, Mr MacIver. I'm very grateful to you for that.

Well, Mr Brown?

MR BROWN: My Lady, may I just take on one point that my learned friend raised, which is the new bullet points that he referred to in terms of references, and the fifth bullet point, which would make reference to discipline in relation to conduct or contact with pupils. We welcome to have that, as was offered, but it would be, I think, particularly helpful if, when that is provided, there can be some expansion on what that means in practice, because obviously reference to discipline that has been proved is one thing, but one of the constant themes is the openness to be aware of allegations, whether proved or otherwise, and it would be interesting if that could be clarified with a covering note.

- 1 LADY SMITH: I agree, that would be helpful. Is that all
- 2 right, Mr MacIver?
- 3 MR MACIVER: Yes, that would be entirely appropriate. It
- 4 was envisaged that an explanation --
- 5 LADY SMITH: Thank you very much.
- 6 MR BROWN: I'm obliged.
- 7 My Lady, that concludes the submissions for this
- 8 part of the Inquiry. Tomorrow we are going to have
- 9 a morning, I think, of read-ins in relation to Loretto
- 10 because there were some statements which came forward
- 11 which clarified one of the matters that was raised or
- 12 touched on this morning, the complaints by Mr Stock.
- 13 LADY SMITH: Indeed.
- 14 MR BROWN: So that will take place tomorrow, but then phase
- three, Fettes, will begin in a fortnight's time.
- 16 LADY SMITH: Indeed. Thank you very much. I'll rise now
- 17 until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and again it doesn't
- sound as though tomorrow's going to take the full day.
- 19 We'll be done within the morning; is that right?
- 20 MR BROWN: I think that's absolutely right, my Lady.
- 21 I think we would anticipate being finished probably
- 22 around the same time as today.
- 23 LADY SMITH: Very well. Thank you very much to everybody
- 24 who's attended today.
- 25 (12.12 pm)

1	(The inquiry adjourned until 10.00 a
2	on Friday, 12 November 2021)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1				-	INDEX
2		, ,	1		
3					Brown QC1
4					Dunlop QC16
5	Closing	submissions	bу	Mr	MacIver39
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					