

General Questions

1. Why was the Governing Body not allowed to see the full Smith report and its findings following the tribunal of 2019?
2. Why was only a partial account and severely redacted version given to the Governing Body and in a press release, stress the one minor criticism of Percy, but not the rest of the findings which criticised members of Governing Body found and concluded that the charges were not upheld? Who took this decision?
3. Why was the Governing Body never given a chance to discuss the costs that the college incurred by taking Percy to tribunal and subsequent actions against him?
4. Why was the statutory "immoral, scandalous and disgraceful" charge allowed to stand publicly against Percy for several months in 2018-19 with the implication that he had been accused of sexual crimes rather than a dispute about committee structure and finances, which was at that stage what he was being accused of? Was it a concerted attempt to pre-emptively blacken his name and reputation?
5. Does the Governing Body accept the criticism made of its conduct by the Charity Commission in November 2022 and what is it doing to ensure future compliance?
6. Winckworth Sherwood were instructed to "act against the Dean". As Governing Body did not issue that instruction, can Christ Church confirm which trustees did issue that instruction, and also oversaw the ensuing expenditure of charitable funds to that end?
7. Who took the decision to conceal the legal costs from Governing Body (from 2018-22) and also conceal the legal expenditure of the charity in the published accounts?
8. Please can Christ Church explain how their conflicts of interest policy works in relation to:
 - a. Canon Ward and Prof. Johnson being part of the Core Group in 2020 (for the safeguarding allegations against the Dean);
 - b. Canon Ward and Canon Foot sitting on Panel One and Two (June-October 2018);
 - c. Canon Peers directing Kate Wood's independent investigation in conjunction with Winckworth Sherwood, including redacting the Dean's testimony whilst also adding to and augmenting prosecution witness statements after Kate Wood had interviewed the Dean;
 - d. Kate Wood working with Canon Peers and others to corroborate and strengthen prosecution evidence against the Dean, after the investigation had closed;
 - e. Prof. Watson attempting to play a key role in Kate Wood's investigation, when he was in the same week appearing in court as a witness against the Dean;

- f. Canon Chaffey sitting on the second Statute XXXIX tribunal panel as a judge, when he had already adjudged the Dean to be sufficiently guilty to merit a trial;
- g. Prof. Bose sitting as the other Governing Body member on the Statute XXXIX tribunal, having previously been married to one of the seven prosecutors;
- h. and Prof. Judson seeking to remove the Dean on grounds of mental incapacity, when he had already been a prosecution witness in the Smith Tribunal, and also previously acted against him?