



social care  
institute for excellence

# **Diocese of Manchester independent safeguarding audit (May 2017)**



The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) improves the lives of people who use care services by sharing knowledge about what works.

We are a leading improvement support agency and an independent charity working with adults', families' and children's care and support services across the UK. We also work closely with related services such as health care and housing.

We improve the quality of care and support services for adults and children by:

- identifying and sharing knowledge about what works and what's new
- supporting people who plan, commission, deliver and use services to put that knowledge into practice
- informing, influencing and inspiring the direction of future practice and policy.

First published in Great Britain in September 2017  
by the Social Care Institute for Excellence and the Church of England

© Church of England

All rights reserved

Written by Hugh Constant, Susan Ellery and Edi Carmi

**Social Care Institute for Excellence**

Kinnaird House  
1 Pall Mall East  
London SW1Y 5BP  
tel 020 7766 7400  
[www.scie.org.uk](http://www.scie.org.uk)



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Context	1
1.2	The Diocese	1
1.3	Structure of the report	2
<b>2</b>	<b>FINDINGS</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Safeguarding Management	3
2.2	Diocesan safeguarding adviser/s	6
2.3	Diocesan Safeguarding Group	8
2.4	Guidance, policies and procedures	11
2.5	Casework	12
2.6	Training	14
2.7	Safe Recruitment of clergy, lay officers and volunteers	16
2.8	Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)	17
2.9	Complaints and whistleblowing	17
2.10	Quality assurance processes	18
2.11	How the Diocese provides support and monitoring of safeguarding in parishes	18
2.12	Resources for children and vulnerable adults	21
2.13	Information sharing	21
2.14	Links with National Safeguarding Team	22
2.15	Anything else?	23
<b>3</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1	What's working well?	24
3.2	What needs to improve?	24
	<b>APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS</b>	<b>26</b>
	Data collection	26

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 CONTEXT

The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) has been commissioned to undertake an audit of the safeguarding arrangements of each diocese of the Church of England. The aim of these audits is to work together to understand how safeguarding is working in each diocese, and to support the continuing improvements being made. Following pilot audits of four dioceses in 2015, an agreed audit model is being applied nationally during 2016 and 2017.

The audit of the Diocese of Manchester was carried out by Hugh Constant (the lead auditor for this diocese) and Susan Ellery from 23 to 25 May 2017. This was in the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attack on the Manchester Arena, and SCIE would like to extend its thanks to the diocese for their commitment in proceeding with the audit.

The audit process involved an examination of case files and other documents, along with conversations with key individuals and focus groups of parish representatives in the diocese. Details of the process are provided in the appendix.

This report was written by Hugh Constant with support from Susan Ellery. Quality assurance was provided by Edi Carmi, the senior auditing lead.

## 1.2 THE DIOCESE

The Diocese of Manchester is home to 2.1 million people, making it one of the most populous within the Church of England. It was founded in 1847, and has 325 places of worship across 259 parishes. An average of around 28,000 people worship each week.

The Bishop of Manchester leads the Diocese, and is supported by two Suffragan Bishops: the Bishop of Bolton and the Bishop of Middleton.

There are four archdeaconries within the Diocese: Manchester, Salford, Bolton and Rochdale. Each contains areas which fall within the 1 per cent most-deprived areas nationally, and 44.5 per cent of parishes are within the 10 per cent most deprived in England. Coupled with this, there are urban centres which are regenerating and thriving. The Diocese incorporates 11 local authorities, but the Greater Manchester area is developing a more extensive regional approach to public service provision, and has recently elected its first metropolitan mayor. Nearly all parishes have some involvement in social projects such as emergency food provision, which will have safeguarding implications.

The population is diverse, although this varies across the Diocese. In Manchester, 35 per cent of the people are non-white; in Wigan the figure is close to five per cent. There are large Muslim and Jewish populations in the area. There are over 100,000 students, and a large, settled LGBT community.

## 1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

This report is divided into:

- Introduction
- The findings of the audit [links have been made with the s.11 (Children Act 2004) Church of England national audit form]
- Considerations for the diocese are listed, where relevant, at the end of each finding
- Conclusions of the auditors' findings: what is working well and areas for further development
- An appendix sets out the audit process and any limitations to this audit
- Please note that the term 'considerations' instead of recommendations is used in the SCIE Learning Together methodology. The reason for this is that it is important that each diocese decides exactly how to implement the improvements indicated; this is likely to be different from place to place. Some considerations will be around taking specific types of action, whilst others will be alerting the diocese to develop its safeguarding planning in the future.

## 2 FINDINGS

### 2.1 SAFEGUARDING MANAGEMENT

#### 2.1.1 Leadership

Safeguarding in the Diocese of Manchester is led by the Bishop. The Bishop came to the Diocese with a strong safeguarding background, having been the delegated safeguarding lead in the Diocese of Worcester for 13 years in his role as Suffragan Bishop of Dudley. This gave him hands-on experience of, for example, drawing up safeguarding action plans, recruiting Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers (DSAs), and commissioning external audits. The Bishop also spoke of incorporating Cathedral safeguarding in Worcester into wider diocesan arrangements. It was mentioned to the auditors that the Bishop has an unusually good grasp of the mechanics of how organisations should work.

The Bishop sees his safeguarding leadership role as one of 'setting the tone' that safeguarding is a top-line priority for him and for the Diocese. An example of this is the letters he sends to clergy before any licence is given, making it explicit that safeguarding training will be required without exception. He cited also his visits to Church House most weeks to pop in on the DSA and others. A number of other people mentioned the Bishop's requirement of a DBS check before ordination, even where that delays people taking on roles, or they miss an ordination ceremony they had wanted to share with their peers.

A strand of thinking for the Bishop is that the bar must be lowered around safeguarding – both in terms of information sharing generally, but also in terms of access to him. He sees a failure to share information as one of the things that has blighted safeguarding in the Church, and is determined to develop a culture of communication in Manchester.

Another part of the tone the Bishop is seeking to set is that safeguarding should become something to take pride in; that it is not a burden, but an important and good part of the life of the Diocese. He wrote the introduction to the first safeguarding newsletter in February 2017, and stressed that 'we are very privileged that we are entrusted with so many young people and older ones with specific vulnerabilities', which seems to reinforce the message that safeguarding is something to be positively embraced.

The Bishop's involvement in cases was limited to being kept informed in most instances, and he appeared respectful of the DSA's expertise. Where the Clergy Disciplinary Measures (CDM) is used, he made the final decision in his role as Bishop, and was assiduous in making sure that he was a neutral figure when he did so, unbiased by any previous involvement in the case. The auditors saw evidence of a thoughtful and consultative approach to this aspect of his role. This meant some decisions took a long time to be reached, but the thoroughness of the approach also meant that – where the decision was challenged by the member of clergy in question, the decision was ultimately upheld in every occurrence.

An additional task the Bishop has set himself is to develop links with Manchester's

large LGBT community, and to recognise that within it there may be less conventional stories of abuse with which people may need support.

The Bishop delegates the operational safeguarding lead to his Chaplain. This is an uncommon arrangement, and the auditors sought to understand the potential strengths and weaknesses of it. The Bishop made the decision to change – the delegated lead role used to sit with the Bishop of Middleton – because the Chaplain is in daily contact with him, and so it means the Bishop can easily be kept abreast of developments. The arrangement thus meets the ‘lowering the bar’ standard for safeguarding communication that the Bishop is seeking.

The Chaplain has been the safeguarding lead for six months, and is well-placed within diocesan structures to oversee the safeguarding agenda. He sits on the Bishop’s Leadership Team, and is the link to it from the Diocesan Safeguarding Panel (DSP). He also links the DSA and the Bishop. The Chaplain sees another part of his role as championing safeguarding at Diocesan Synod, by giving the message that safeguarding is not an externally-imposed barrier to mission and ministry, but is a central part of it, without which no good mission or ministry can occur. This theme was expressed to the auditors, in various ways, by all the senior clergy to whom they spoke, which suggests a well-embedded positive attitude towards safeguarding.

In a set-up in which the DSA has professional supervision, is line managed by the Diocesan Secretary, and has regular meetings with the Chair of the DSP (see 2.2 and 2.3), the Chaplain sees his role in relation to the DSA as a ‘professional friend’, and as someone who can ensure she has the proper access to, and support from, the Bishop.

The auditors saw evidence of the Chaplain’s involvement and support in casework, and the part he plays in core groups as appropriate.

While the Chaplain frequently visits parishes, for example to lead services, the role is not one that formally links to parishes. As parishes are where the daily business of safeguarding needs to take place, the Diocese perhaps needs to consider how as safeguarding lead, the Chaplain can champion it in the parishes. It may be that more formal links with the archdeacons can help (see 2.11), and the Chaplain should use the opportunity of leading services in parishes to check, for example, if they have a safeguarding policy, or to keep an eye on whether good safeguarding practice appears to be taking place.

It is positive that the Diocese sets out a job description for the role of delegated safeguarding lead.

Another link between the DSP and the Bishop’s Leadership Team is the Diocesan Secretary, who has worked in the Diocese for 16 years, and has been in his current role for six. With the support of the Bishop, the Diocesan Secretary has reorganised the functions of the diocesan administration and services, with an emphasis that it should not regard itself as the centre. The parishes are at the heart of what the Church does, and the diocesan administration and services exist to support them.

The Diocesan Office appears to function well, and safeguarding seems well-supported by other functions such as human resources and communications. The

DSA was extremely positive about the overall support she receives from other departments in the diocese.

### **2.1.2 Structure**

The Bishop's Leadership Team meets monthly, and consists of all three Bishops, four archdeacons, the Dean of Manchester Cathedral, the Diocesan Secretary, the Director of Mission and Ministry and the Bishop's Chaplain. Safeguarding is on every agenda, and each month the DSA compiles a brief report for the meeting, with an overview of cases and other safeguarding developments. In addition, the DSP reports annually to the Leadership Team. The Bishop's Leadership Team is the principal mechanism by which senior diocesan staff are briefed on safeguarding, with the Bishop's Staff Team, which is a larger body, meeting less frequently.

The reports to the Leadership Team are primarily for information sharing, but the Chaplain is available to answer any queries his colleagues may have. The approach appears to work well in terms of keeping senior people informed.

### **2.1.3 Links with the Cathedral**

The Dean is on the Bishop's Leadership Team and thus receives the safeguarding reports, and this reflects a growing safeguarding link between the Cathedral and the Diocese. The auditors heard little about the Cathedral during the site visit, but the fact that the Cathedral uses the DSA for casework, and sat on the audit preparation group, indicates a positive and developing relationship.

### **2.1.4 Culture**

There appeared to the auditors to be a good, cohesive leadership culture around safeguarding, with everyone clear of their role, even if people could develop those roles further (see Considerations here and in 2.11). The unity of the senior team was mentioned, and it does appear to be functioning well.

While much of the leadership culture that the Bishop and others are trying to inculcate is mentioned above, it is worth noting that the Diocese has a set of Six Safeguarding Principles, prioritised by importance.

They are:

- Prevention, as far as possible, from future harm
- Justice for past failings
- Pastoral support for victims
- Maximum transparency within the limits of legal and pastoral confidentiality
- Pastoral support for offenders (or those accused)
- Management of safeguarding issues to protect the interests of the Diocese and the Church of England in a manner consistent with priorities 1–4

The principles, devised by the Diocesan Secretary before the current DSA took up her post, are used as part of the Terms of Reference for the DSP, and are used in training, to make it explicit to people that the prevention of harm is their principal duty

in relation to safeguarding. While some people may debate the exact ordering, that the Diocese has attempted to map out the principles by which it operates in safeguarding does give a useful framework to their efforts.

*(Reference: part 1 of S.11 audit: Provide a structure to manage safeguarding in the Diocese. Also to part 2: The Bishop appoints a member of his senior staff to be the lead person for safeguarding.)*

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*The Bishop's Leadership Team to consider how the outward facing role of the safeguarding lead is made more explicit in fronting safeguarding issues in governance structures (Diocesan Synod and Bishop's Council), in training (contributing to Formation Days etc.) and in diocesan conferences and gatherings.*

## **2.2 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISER/S**

The Diocese of Manchester has one, full-time Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser, employed for 35 hours per week. She has been in role since January 2015, and is a direct employee of the Diocese.

The DSA is a qualified social worker (identified in her person specification as the preferred professional background), whose career prior to the role had primarily been in children's services. She also has experience working with vulnerable adults, including those with mental health problems, and has experience delivering training. As such, her background appears ideal for the mixed nature of the DSA role.

As the only employee in the safeguarding service, the DSA is currently responsible for children's and adults' casework, training, and policy and procedures. Although a number of support services are commissioned from the Churches' Child Protection Advisory Service (CCPAS), as will be seen at various points in this report, the safeguarding resource is significantly below what it needs to be. This has been recognised to some extent, and an advert to recruit a full-time worker to lead on training, and to support the DSA with some aspects of casework, is imminently to be put out.

The Diocese first employed a safeguarding adviser in 1997, and the first incumbent was in post for 10 years. The current DSA has major reservations about safeguarding practice during that time. For a number of years, Manchester then shared a DSA with two neighbouring dioceses, which came to be seen as a wholly inadequate provision. In the immediate run-up to the current DSA's arrival, there were some very short-lived appointments, and the support of CCPAS to provide basic cover in the interims between appointments.

The consequence of such an unsettled provision is that the current DSA arrived to find little by way of a functioning service in place. The auditors have seen indications that very basic aspects of casework, such as a risk assessment template, or a recording system, have had to be put in place. The DSA estimates that she spent her first year in post learning the job, and that it was only after two years that she had caught up on gaps in past casework, and had put in place the core elements of a structure to support her work. The DSA is responsible for a clear improvement in safeguarding frameworks within the Diocese.

CCPAS is commissioned to provide an out-of-hours call service, primarily to take any urgent calls and signpost the caller to emergency services if necessary. This does mean the DSA is shielded from new referrals outside office hours. Nonetheless, she does a significant amount of work in the evenings, and also works on most Saturdays. Her statement that she 'tries not to work on Sundays' suggests that is not always successful. The DSA acknowledges that she rarely uses her full annual leave entitlement, although again CCPAS is commissioned to provide holiday cover. There would appear to be a risk, therefore, of the DSA over-stretching herself, in part because she does not feel that CCPAS's work in her absence is sufficiently robust.

It was however evident that the Diocese is very supportive of the DSA, and she is urged to take her holidays, and protect her personal time. A combination of the inadequate resource for safeguarding, and the DSA's own determination to be thorough and professional in her role, means that in practice she works well over her contracted hours on a regular basis.

The limits imposed by only having one member of staff were evident in delays to particular pieces of work such as the deceased clergy file review.

The DSA is becoming better known across the Diocese, and is earning a reputation as a prompt and skilled source of support. In the annual survey of which diocesan function is most valued by clergy in parishes, safeguarding has risen from fifth to first in the time the DSA has been in post. This does however generate more work, as people feel confident to contact the DSA with queries. This heightens the urgency of bolstering the safeguarding service.

As mentioned above, it is positive that the Diocese is recruiting a training lead, but training typically leads to more casework, as people develop awareness of and confidence in the safeguarding service and see situations in a new, safeguarding light. The Diocese should consider the possibility that further expansion of the team, perhaps to include administrative support, may be needed in the years ahead.

### **2.2.1 Management and supervision**

There is a good management structure around the DSA. She is line managed by the Diocesan Secretary, with whom she appears to have a good relationship, and who deals with the practicalities of things like annual leave. The Diocesan Secretary is responsible for the DSA's continuing professional development, and is seen as unfailingly supportive when she needs to attend training. The DSA attends national safeguarding training provided by the Church of England and relevant training from external agencies (including training provided by local authorities).

In addition, the DSA receives support from the Bishop's Chaplain (see 2.1) in his role as safeguarding lead. There are monthly meetings between the DSA and the Chair of the DSP, in which the Chair sees her role as the DSA's 'critical friend', able to provide support but with a freedom that comes from being somewhat detached from the Diocese.

Linked to the DSP (see 2.3 for more details) are case discussion meetings that the DSA has regularly with police and probation partners, to discuss complex cases. This provides valued support to the DSA.

The DSA also has professional supervision, paid for by the Diocese. The supervisor is a qualified social worker, and the function of the sessions is to allow the DSA to reflect on her professional responsibilities, and to ensure she meets her duties as an HCPC-registered social worker. The DSA described the current arrangement, in which she sees her professional supervisor for two hours a month, as being more than she needed. The Diocesan Secretary, who funds the supervision, sees it as a private reflective space for the DSA, and so would only contact, or expect contact from, the supervisor in an emergency. He is however planning to seek her input to inform the DSA's annual appraisal.

The auditors saw some evidence on the case files that supervision discussions are directly informing case work. The case discussion meetings, however, appear to be more directly useful. Given the various different sources of support that the DSA receives, and the fact that a new staff member will be joining the DSA, the Diocese could usefully review the support structures around the DSA and her new colleague.

### **2.2.2 Any potential conflicts of interests to the DSA's independence**

The DSA's father is an area dean in the Diocese. The DSA has discussed this with the Diocesan Secretary, and the Chair of the DSP. Were there to be a conflict of interest, people would therefore be aware of it, and the DSA has an agreement to seek an independent sense-check on any decision-making from the Chair of the DSP in these instances. The DSA was able to cite an example where she was clear with her professional boundaries with her father.

*(References: part 1 of S11 audit: Appoint a suitably qualified DSA, and provide financial, organisational and management support. The adviser must have full access to clergy files and other confidential material.*

*Part 6: The DSA's role is clear in the job description and person specification. And The DSA has sufficient time, funding, supervision and support to fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities, including local policy development, casework, advice, liaison with statutory authorities, training, personal and professional development and professional registration.*

*Part 8: The DSA should be given access to professional supervision to ensure their practice is reviewed and improves over time.)*

#### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*To prioritise the recruitment of a safeguarding professional to deliver training and to support with some aspects of casework.*

*To consider future funding plans in light of the possibility that a successful training programme is likely to increase casework further.*

*Review the support structure on offer to the DSA and her new colleague, to maximise its usefulness.*

## **2.3 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING GROUP**

The Diocesan Safeguarding Panel (DSP) has been operating in its current form since November 2015, with its Chair taking her first meeting in August 2016. It is

thus still in a formative stage, but appears to have been well thought through, and to be functioning effectively.

The previous iteration of the Group was not felt to be successful, and the DSA visited a diocese in the Canterbury province to learn from them how a successful panel could function. This suggests an openness to new ideas and a desire for improvement, and appears to have contributed the development and professionalisation of the DSP.

The Chair was recruited following a competitive selection process, and is paid a daily rate for up to 12 days' work per year. She is a qualified social worker, and has held senior positions in local authorities and voluntary agencies. She has led a number of serious case reviews for the Manchester LSCB, and used to chair the Child Death Overview Panel. The Chair was previously a safeguarding consultant for an adoption agency, and has long been interested in safeguarding within a faith context. She is well-qualified for the role.

The terms of reference for the DSP are built around the six safeguarding principles of the Diocese:

- Prevention, as far as possible, from future harm
- Justice for past failings
- Pastoral support for victims
- Maximum transparency within the limits of legal and pastoral confidentiality
- Pastoral support for offenders (or those accused)
- Management of safeguarding issues to protect the interests of the Diocese and the Church of England in a manner consistent with priorities 1–4

From these are drawn the panel's main objectives: developing and overseeing the implementation of policies and procedures; a training programme; ensuring good liaison with statutory agencies; case oversight; overseeing the DBS system; awareness raising; auditing and reviewing diocesan safeguarding; and reporting to the national Church.

The membership of DSP, according to the Terms of Reference, is:

- Independent Chair
- DSA
- Diocesan Secretary
- Bishop's Chaplain
- Cathedral Administrator
- Education Department representative
- Parish Safeguarding Officer (PSO)
- Representatives from:
  - Police
  - Probation
  - Local Authority Designated Officers (LADOs)
  - CCPAS

- Children's Social Services
- Adult Social Services

In practice, the Director of Mission & Ministry, a diocesan youth worker and a member of the Creative Support team are also regular attenders. Whilst there is good representation from the police, probation and a LADO, wider local authority membership has not yet been identified. A curate, who was a former lead safeguarding nurse, is on the DSP, in lieu of a PSO. The Chair is also keen to recruit a representative from the adult voluntary sector. It may be helpful to review the terms of reference once the membership has bedded down.

There are no archdeacons on the panel. As discussed in 2.1 and 2.11, the archdeacons have an important role to play in supporting parishes to thrive, and in ensuring parishes are compliant with their responsibilities. The auditors think it could be beneficial to have an archdeacon's presence on the DSP, to feed in their perspective, and to hear from colleagues what the current safeguarding challenges are. This would strengthen their strategic links with the Chaplain as safeguarding lead, and would make the panel compliant with the forthcoming Promoting a Safer Church guidance on panel membership.

The group meets quarterly, and provides an annual report to the Bishop's Leadership Team. The meetings are well attended, and appear to be dynamic, in that actions are set and then completed. The auditors heard genuine enthusiasm from panel members about the work of the Group and its future potential. It appears to be an important support to the DSA.

There are no formal meetings scheduled between the Chair of the DSP and the Bishop. In themselves these may not be necessary, as long as the Diocese is satisfied there is sufficient access to the Bishop for the Chair.

The DSP has put together a development plan, which runs up until the period of the SCIE audit, and which will be refreshed following it. As the panel matures, it could usefully focus on quality assurance, through making better use of parish safeguarding returns, case sampling and other mechanisms (see 2.10), to explicitly meet the 'audit and review' element of its terms of reference.

There are monthly meetings between the DSA and the Chair of the DSP, where any cases of concern are discussed, and can be brought to the full panel if necessary.

Each month, there is also a case discussion meeting, involving the DSA, police – a representative from the Sex Offenders Management Unit and from Operation Hydrant (the police investigation into non-recent child sex abuse) – and probation. This is not a formal sub-group of the DSP, but feels linked to it in that panel members sit upon it. The DSA seems to have brought the group together to act as a sounding board in relation to a number of past cases where she had concerns about how the Diocese had handled them at the time. The meetings have also supported the DSA in developing tools such as the risk assessment form she uses.

The work on non-recent cases is coming to an end, which may make it unnecessary to meet as frequently. The DSP could consider the future make-up of the case discussion meetings, which seem to function very well, and whether they should be

formally part of the DSP structure. They appear to play a useful role in ensuring the DSP itself can take a strategic focus, and not become overwhelmed in case specifics. This could form part of a wider reflection upon the support structures around the DSA (see 2.2).

There is training sub-group of the DSP (see 2.6).

*(Reference: part 1 of S.11 audit: Provide a structure to manage safeguarding in the Diocese. Also to part 2: The Bishop appoints a member of his senior staff to be the lead person for safeguarding.)*

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*Consider reviewing the Terms of Reference to reflect changing membership.*

*Consider whether membership of the DSP would help the archdeacons formally contribute to the strategic development of safeguarding in the Diocese (see 2.11).*

*To satisfy itself as to the level of access to the Bishop for the Chair of the DSP.*

*Determine the future structure of the case discussion meetings, including whether they are a formal sub-group of the DSP.*

## **2.4 GUIDANCE, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

The Diocese has a comprehensive Handbook of Policy and Procedures. It incorporates all the national policies, which have been adopted locally. It was most recently updated in May 2017.

The handbook manages the balance between accessibility and thoroughness quite well, and would seem to be a practical resource for people. There are helpful templates, clear flowcharts about what to do in the event of a concern, and a useful introduction which places safeguarding within a theological as well as a legal context. It is easily found on the diocesan website, as are the national policies which underpin it.

The safeguarding arrangements for the Cathedral and the Cathedral choir are well-incorporated into the document.

A foreword endorsing the handbook from the Bishop and/or the Chair of the DSP might help reinforce the message that this is an important document.

The adult safeguarding section reflects the recent Care Act, but is missing discussion of self-neglect as a safeguarding issue.

*(Reference: part 1 of the S. 11 audit: Ensure the Diocesan Synod adopts the House of Bishop's safeguarding policies, together with any additional diocesan procedures and good practice guidelines.)*

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*Consider an endorsement of the handbook by a senior figure in the Diocese.*

*An updated version should include a discussion about self-neglect.*

## 2.5 CASEWORK

### 2.5.1 Quality of response to allegations

The quality of the casework by the DSA is high. The auditors saw evidence of a number of key strengths in her practice. The DSA has developed good working relationships with others, and the case files showed appropriate information sharing and joint working with diocesan colleagues, other DSAs, and with statutory partners. Three LADOs gave the auditors feedback about their work with the DSA, and this was universally positive.

The DSA is extremely diligent; the major effort she has put in to reviewing all of her predecessors' casework demonstrates high standards and a willingness to put in the time to make sure those standards are consistently met. This approach is evident in more recent cases also, and is clearly an asset. Recognising that safeguarding is a team effort, the DSA is willing to chivvy senior colleagues and fellow professionals to ensure tasks are completed.

This thoroughness is balanced by an empathetic and intelligent approach to what are often complex situations, and the case files demonstrated successful interventions that depended on a very skilled level of interaction with people. This was evident in two cases that were not straightforward matters involving actual abuse, but where the DSA was able to do important preventative and supportive work.

Members of the Parish Focus Group were mostly extremely appreciative of the quality of the casework support that they receive from the DSA. One person dissented strongly from this view, and raised important questions about information-sharing practices (see 2.13).

Generally, the auditors took the view that cases were well managed, and that safeguarding judgments were robust.

The auditors felt that there were a number of cases in which the DSA led a safeguarding response to matters which were perhaps more properly dealt with as disciplinary or HR cases. Clearly, sometimes initial work needs to be undertaken to establish whether what is going on is a safeguarding matter, but on occasion the DSA went beyond this. This theme was mentioned by some senior people in the Diocese also, and the DSA could helpfully use her supervision sessions and meetings to reflect upon this.

In some cases, where there were safeguarding concerns, the auditors felt there was a tendency for the DSA to take too many of the tasks upon herself – such as making referrals, or handling communication between people. The auditors recognised this as being a product perhaps of the DSA's impressive diligence and attention to detail, but a developmental goal may be to entrust others with more tasks, not least to free herself up to tackle her sizeable workload.

That workload led in some cases to significant delays in casework. The auditors felt that such delays, which were at times quite considerable, were not because of any laxity on the DSA's part – as mentioned, she sets very high standards for herself – but because the caseload is simply too great.

Throughout the case files, there was evidence of appropriate and effective use of core groups, and the DSA expressed her appreciation of core groups as a mechanism, and her willingness to use them even where policy would not mandate them.

### **2.5.2 Quality of risk assessment and safeguarding contracts**

Safeguarding contracts – known locally as Safeguarding Agreements (and formerly as Covenants of Care) – were used appropriately in the case files the auditors saw. In instances where the auditors questioned whether there ought/ought not be an agreement, the thinking of the DSA was reflective and sound about her decision. There was evidence of thinking through each case on an individual basis, and tailoring agreements accordingly. The DSA described how she typically asks the subject of the agreement to describe what they had done to necessitate it, so that any signs of people minimising their offences could be spotted.

The agreements do not quite adhere to national guidance, in that they identify a review period (within either six or 12 months) rather than a specific review date. In addition, who has a copy is determined at the relevant meeting and is not specified on the agreement. Otherwise they are good. There is some inconsistency between cases about who signs agreements, but they appear to be regularly reviewed.

Similarly, the thinking around risk assessments seems robust, and they are used fittingly. The format used for what would be considered Type A<sup>1</sup> risk assessments was developed locally, with police and probation input at the case discussion meetings. The template appears to work effectively, but does lack some elements of the national template, such as statutory recommendations and listing protective factors. The auditors saw one Type B<sup>2</sup> risk assessment, commissioned appropriately.

### **2.5.3 Recording systems**

Recording is generally of a very high quality. The DSA has worked assiduously since her arrival to develop a filing system, and to incorporate the paperwork of her various predecessors into it. Each case now has a clear, well-structured case file, stored securely.

In August 2015, the Diocese decided to move to an electronic system, and now uses CPOMS – an education-based system which was recommended by the same southern diocese from whom Manchester sought advice regarding their DSP (see 2.3). The files that were on CPOMS were similarly thorough, and casework was easy to track.

---

<sup>1</sup> Type A Risk Assessments are used either to manage immediate risks prior to a Type B assessment, or where there are concerns about the risk posed by a non-church officer – typically a member of the congregation.

<sup>2</sup> Type B Risk Assessments are used where church officers are alleged to have caused harm, or where there are other complexities or conflicts of interest.

There were some examples of very high standards of recording practice, for example dating retrospective edits to case files. The auditors saw also a small number of mistakes in recording, such as getting the name of a perpetrator or a diocese wrong, which would suggest recording is sometimes done in too great a rush.

The DSA maintains a separate record of queries which do not develop into full cases. The record is useful to map any future concerns that may be raised against previous contacts.

*(Reference: part 1 of S. 11 audit: Provide access to a risk assessment service so the Bishop and others can evaluate and manage any risk posed by individuals or activities within the Church.)*

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*The Diocesan Secretary and the DSA's professional supervisor to consider with the DSA safeguarding thresholds in disciplinary cases and how to best reserve her time for safeguarding cases alone.*

*DSA to consider greater delegation of tasks.*

*The Diocese to consider whether local risk assessments and Covenants of Care are compliant with national guidance, and incorporate improvements as necessary.*

## **2.6 TRAINING**

### **2.6.1 Delivery**

The Diocese faces a considerable challenge in training its many clergy, other licensed people, and – especially – its volunteers. A key part of meeting this challenge will be the recruitment of a trainer (see 2.2).

Given the limited resource available within the safeguarding service, a lot of progress has been made over the last two years. The Diocese locates the responsibility for safeguarding training within the Directorate of Mission & Ministry, which helps make it feel like a mainstream part of clerical training, rather than an external add-on. The Director of Mission & Ministry has been a dynamic supporter of the DSA in getting training done. In addition, a curate with an adult safeguarding background, a youth minister and a children's minister have delivered a large number of training sessions. Members of the Parish Focus Group acknowledged the usefulness of having a broad range of experience among the trainers.

The Diocese has a training strategy, which is steered by the training sub-group of the DSP (see 2.3). The sub-group consists of the DSA, the Director of Mission & Ministry, the Bishop's Chaplain, the curate mentioned earlier, and a benefice-level PSO. The strategy was last updated in February 2017.

The strategic approach has been to focus in the first instance on licensed clergy, readers, and people with PTO. Over a number of Formation Days dedicated to safeguarding training in 2016, all but seven clergy received training that matches the requirements of the C3 leadership course from the National Safeguarding Team's

Learning and Development Framework. Those people who did not attend received progressively sharper communication about the requirement to come to sessions in early 2017. Only two clergy remain untrained – one of whom will be trained in July 2017, and one of whom is ill.

The Bishop made it clear the training was mandatory, and he felt the sessions had been a success, not least in marrying up the ecclesiastical and the practical aspects of safeguarding. The Bishop and the Director of Mission & Ministry described some very poor safeguarding training delivered previously, and which damaged the image of safeguarding training. They felt these more recent sessions have repaired a lot of that damage.

The next immediate challenge is to train people in various voluntary roles with the relevant national framework courses. Around 600 volunteers have been trained at a series of events over the last six months, but this is out of a volunteer body estimated to be over 2,000-strong, and which is inevitably somewhat fluid. The children's minister and youth minister continue to deliver C1/C2 sessions monthly, in sessions that are varied in terms of timing and venue. The development of an online C1 course should be helpful. The Diocese is conscious of the need to balance the national framework requirements with the need to not make safeguarding training feel like such a burden that people are put off from volunteering.

The specialist modules of the framework also need to be delivered. There is local concern about the quality and applicability of some of the specialist modules. The Director of Mission & Ministry also feels that some of the nuances of adult safeguarding need to be reflected in the training.

Effective use of the new training person is therefore vital, and it may maximise their impact if they arrive to a fully-planned timetable for training. Further work will therefore be necessary on the training strategy. There are plans for the new worker to shadow the children's and youth ministers who deliver much of the training currently.

When the new appointment is in post, consideration of how case work informs training, and vice versa, will need to be on the DSP agenda.

## **2.6.2 Organisation and recording systems**

The systems for tracking who has done training, and when it therefore needs to be refreshed, are not thought to be entirely robust. The need for certain people to do some specialist courses will complicate the database further, and the Diocese accepts that more thinking needs to go into future-proofing their records.

*(Reference: part 1 of S.11 audit: Select and train those who are to hold the Bishop's Licence in safeguarding matters. Provide training on safeguarding matters to parishes, the Cathedral, other clergy, diocesan organisations, including religious communities and those who hold the Bishop's Licence.*

*And to part 8: Those working closely with children, young people and adults experiencing, or at risk of, abuse or neglect ...have safeguarding in their induction and are trained and have their training refreshed every three years.)*

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*Develop a clear timetable, so the new trainer can work effectively from the beginning.*

*Consider how the trainer and the DSA can work together, so that each can inform the other's practice.*

*Develop a reliable database to record training that has been done and when it needs to be refreshed.*

## **2.7 SAFE RECRUITMENT OF CLERGY, LAY OFFICERS AND VOLUNTEERS**

The clergy Blue Files and the lay recruitment files looked at by the auditors typically showed a good standard of Safe Recruitment practice. While there were some gaps, the great majority of files included application forms, suitable references, personal identity documents, and records of DBS checks.

The auditors saw evidence of the Bishop of Manchester using Current Clergy Status Letters with suitable robustness when clergy left the Diocese. Where appropriate, he was explicit and measured about any safeguarding concerns involving a member of the clergy. It is clear from the Blue Files when there is also a safeguarding concern relating to a particular person.

The Diocesan Safeguarding Panel notes of August 2016 make the argument that good Safe Recruitment practices are not understood or followed in all parishes. Training in Safe Recruitment was offered from September 2016, but some case files did demonstrate gaps in good practice. The Diocese should consider how it can best support those parishes where there remains a lack of clear understanding of what to do. Some parish feedback focused on how the paperwork requirements for Safe Recruitment are disproportionately arduous for voluntary posts.

The Diocese feels this task is complicated by perceived inconsistencies about which posts require a DBS, with recent changes to the rules muddying the waters still further in the eyes of some parishioners.

*(Reference to part 7 of S.11 audit: The Diocesan Secretary has implemented arrangements in line with the House of Bishops' policy on Safer Recruitment 2015. And to part 1: Keep a record of clergy and church officers that will enable a prompt response to bona fide enquiries...where there have been safeguarding concerns, these should be clearly indicated on file.)*

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*How to provide effective ways to support parishes with Safe Recruitment practice.*

## 2.8 DISCLOSURE AND BARRING SERVICE (DBS)

The Diocese uses the Churches' Child Protection Advisory Service (CCPAS) to electronically manage its DBS applications and renewals. This largely works well, although as mentioned in 2.7 people did report a degree of uncertainty about which roles require a DBS check.

According to the 2015 audit return to the National Safeguarding Team, 881 DBS check applications were made that year, with only one return being blemished.

Where the Diocese needs to administer DBS checks, this is done by the Clergy Support Officer, who liaises with the DSA should there be a blemished return.

The auditors saw two appropriate referrals to the DBS for barring in the case work they explored. There were no cases in which it appeared that it ought to have happened but did not.

The current DSA developed the Diocese's risk assessment for responding to blemished DBSs, reinforcing the sense that nearly all the procedures the Diocese has are ones she put in place.

## 2.9 COMPLAINTS AND WHISTLEBLOWING

The Diocese does not have a whistleblowing procedure. The Safeguarding Children and Adults at Risk Handbook (May 2017) does have a section on reporting any concerns someone may have about colleagues who may be harming children or adults at risk, and this is positive. It wouldn't immediately seem to apply, however, to a situation in which there were concerns, for example, that someone was covering up harm by a third party, and so it could usefully be strengthened. It is good that it explicitly covers volunteers as well as paid employees.

The Diocese does not have available a complaints procedure for people who are dissatisfied with the service it provides, including therefore the safeguarding service. The auditors saw instances of people making complaints, but these were usually to the Bishop, which might not be something everyone feels comfortable doing.

*Reference: part 1 of S. 11 audit: Provide a complaints procedure which can be used by those who wish to complain about the handling of safeguarding issues. Also part 4: There is an easily accessible complaints procedure including reference to the Clergy Disciplinary Measures and whistleblowing procedures.*

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*To strengthen the whistleblowing aspects of the safeguarding policy, to cover people not reporting harm, as well as those directly causing it.*

*To develop an easily accessible complaints procedure.*

## 2.10 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

Specific consideration about quality assurance feels like it is in its early stages. There would seem to be potential to make good progress, however. The DSP is now well established, and in a position to explore quality assurance options such as case sampling or benchmarking exercises with other dioceses. This would be additional to the existing quality assurance functions such as the case discussions between the DSA and the Chair.

A useful part of this is likely to be more fully utilising the safeguarding audits that the parishes feed into the Diocese, especially if work can be done to increase the response rate. These could then form the basis of an annual cycle of auditing and reviewing that would enable the Diocese to measure whether its safeguarding efforts are making a difference, and to focus on congregations that seem to be struggling to meet the basic requirements of formal adoption of a safeguarding policy by the PCC, an annual report to the PCC, and having a trained PSO.

Making use of this data, and of other feedback such as training evaluation, would be facilitated by dedicated administrative support. This is not a model the Diocese uses, but given that, it should consider ways in which any data can be analysed within the existing administrative staffing.

In time, the Diocese may wish to develop quality assurance systems that make use of quantitative data and the more qualitative 'soft' information that comes from reporting by people across the Diocese, regarding their confidence about an understanding of what safeguarding is and why it matters, and how to respond if and when they have a concern.

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*The DSP to consider how its next development plan can explicitly include a quality assurance element, and how that work could be done within current staffing structures.*

## 2.11 HOW THE DIOCESE PROVIDES SUPPORT & MONITORING OF SAFEGUARDING IN PARISHES

### 2.11.1 Archdeacons' responsibilities

There are four archdeaconries within the Diocese of Manchester, and with the recent appointment of a new Archdeacon of Manchester, all four posts are filled: two by women, two by men.

The archdeacons to whom the auditors spoke discussed how they do still sometimes have to address a lack of awareness of, and on rare occasions resistance to, some aspects of safeguarding in the parishes. The case files reinforced this, with some isolated examples of very poor safeguarding judgment on the part of parish clergy, including incidents where clergy assumed they could handle matters internally in the parish. The archdeacons' response involves stressing that at times it is necessary to be hard-headed on safeguarding. That while there must always be care and support

for the perpetrator, the needs of the victim are a priority, and that just because someone is not prosecuted, or barred from their work, it does not mean that there are no safeguarding concerns to be addressed.

It also involves tackling on two fronts an attitude in some congregations of 'we have no kids here, so we don't need to do safeguarding'. It needs to be pointed out that safeguarding is a matter for adults too (the Parish Focus Group members acknowledged that adult safeguarding is less well understood), but also that children might not attend places where there is a sense that their safety is not a priority. The archdeacons were confident, however, that levels of understanding of safeguarding, and the recognition of its importance to the Church, were higher than ever, especially as new clergy become ordained.

The archdeacons see their role in part as providing backing to the DSA when she is working in their area. There was a high degree of confidence in her work, which while assiduous and thorough, was also empathic and skilled enough to win the support of, for example, long-serving clergy who may not appreciate the changed requirements of modern safeguarding in terms of record-keeping and preventative measures.

Archdeacon Visitations occur every five years, and are sometimes done by area deans. They were seen, therefore, as a useful if infrequent check on parish safeguarding arrangements. One archdeacon had conducted a Visitation the previous week in which, perhaps because of a long period without an incumbent, safeguarding paperwork was out of date and not up to standard, and the archdeacon will be following up on this. Periods of vacancy can lead to a drop in safeguarding standards. The Diocese might want to consider ensuring the DSA and archdeacons pay more attention to parishes during vacancies, and that a structure is in place for the DSA to meet with new incumbents about any safeguarding issues in their parish.

A particular aspect of safeguarding work in a diocese as diverse as Manchester is the question of renting church buildings to other Christian groups, from cultures with different attitudes to, for example, the physical chastisement of children. The archdeacons felt, and this was repeated at parish level, there is further work to be done in ensuring that sub-letting groups, of whatever background, have safeguarding policies of sufficient strength to meet good practice requirements and the demands of insurers. The auditors note that there is useful guidance on this in the diocesan safeguarding policy.

Each year, a pack goes out to parishes, containing Articles of Enquiry, a safeguarding form, and other paperwork. While the archdeacons made it clear that they would expect to be told if these returns highlighted any concerns, they did not see them themselves. This feels to the auditors like a missed opportunity to add to their awareness of parish safeguarding activity. The returns will contain a lot of data, which the auditors presume may help the archdeacons and others identify areas of weak practice, and of good practice, and thus help them shape a diocesan-level plan for promoting good parish safeguarding practice.

The challenge of getting every parish up to standard will be essentially a never-ending one, given the inevitable churn of key people like incumbents, church wardens and parish safeguarding coordinators. The active involvement of archdeacons, with their responsibility for parishes, in the strategic safeguarding structures of the Diocese seems therefore particularly important. Currently, there is

no archdeacon on the Diocesan Safeguarding Panel, and the auditors consider that having an archdeacon there might help the DSP take a holistic view of their work. Having an archdeacon on the DSP would also fulfil a likely recommendation of Promoting a Safer Church (see 2.3).

The archdeacons described core groups as working well in those cases where they had been involved in one. One useful link was with the Bishop's Chaplain, in his role as safeguarding lead. The auditors have discussed (see 2.1) how the Chaplain is well placed to coordinate the safeguarding function at a diocesan level, but does not have an inherently parish-facing role. Linking up more formally with archdeacons on the DSP may help address this.

### **2.11.2 Support given to parish safeguarding coordinators**

Recruiting and retaining Parish Safeguarding Officers (PSOs) is often a challenge, and there was acknowledgment that although many PSOs are skilled and knowledgeable about safeguarding, especially if they work in sectors where it is relevant, there are others who struggle with the role.

Although the auditors spoke only to a small number of PSOs (see Limitations of Audit in the appendix), some useful information was shared. One PSO oversees five others within her benefice, and this model of very local support, to bolster the support the PSOs receive from the DSA, was well regarded. A clear additional benefit is that it frees the DSA up if queries can be tackled at a more local level. This mentoring approach could perhaps be adopted more widely.

There was positive comment about the recent development of more templates and parish-level policy documents, which have given a clear steer to PSOs in most of the situations they come across.

Reflecting the limited resourcing of the safeguarding service, however, general, non-casework support to PSOs is in its infancy. A safeguarding newsletter has recently been introduced, which is a positive development. Further work, such as a structured mentoring or buddying system, or regular training/thank you events for PSOs, would likely enhance the role, but will be difficult to achieve with only one DSA in post.

#### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*Consider whether membership of the DSP would help the archdeacons formally contribute to the strategic development of safeguarding in the Diocese (see 2.3).*

*Consider how to provide extra support to parishes in vacancy.*

*If further communication in relation to parish duties around sub-letting premises is required.*

*When resources allow, develop a support programme for PSOs.*

## 2.12 RESOURCES FOR CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS

The principal offer locally for people affected by abuse in an ecclesiastical setting is to call a Listening Line staffed by CCPAS. The auditors were not able to explore the quality of the service, but it seems at least possible that a telephone service as the first point of contact for someone wanting to discuss abuse may feel detached and off-putting, however well it is operated. The auditors fully accept that for many people, the relative anonymity of a telephone conversation might in fact be a benefit, as is demonstrated by the success of services such as ChildLine and the Samaritans. And it is important to note that a call to the Listening Line can then lead to face-to-face support, and if necessary to ongoing counselling, commissioned by the Diocese. Nonetheless, not having the option to offer face-to-face support to survivors in the first instance does not feel like best practice, and falls short of national requirements for Authorised Listeners.

The Diocese has children's and youth ministers who are very supportive of the safeguarding work that goes on, and help deliver diocesan safeguarding training. They may well be an asset in finding out from people what a safe church would feel like, and how the Diocese can develop systems to listen to vulnerable people who may have safeguarding concerns.

As the Diocese supports vulnerable people further through efforts such as food banks, its Fresh Expressions and other innovative forms of worship, the need to ensure everyone feels safe in church settings will grow. Hearing from people about what they need will therefore be important. The Diocese has made a lot of progress in growing dementia-friendly churches, so has experience of accommodating the extra requirements people may have in order to feel safe.

The auditors recognise that initiatives such as proactively working to foster a safe church culture, and to respond effectively to people who may have been harmed, will require additional input from the DSA, and may therefore have to wait until the safeguarding service is more fully staffed.

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*When capacity allows, seek the active engagement of children and vulnerable adults to help inform a culture of safe worship.*

*Consider how to implement an offer to survivors of church-related abuse that allows for face-to-face support, in line with House of Bishops' guidance.*

## 2.13 INFORMATION SHARING

Information sharing appears to work well in the Diocese. Given the large number of local authorities, it is positive that there did not appear to be any problems sharing information with adults' or children's services. Greater Manchester has only one police force, however, and the relationship with the police appeared very positive. This is reflected in police involvement in the DSP, which helps with the exchange of information, particularly in case discussion meetings.

Information sharing within the Diocese is a strength, and reflects the benefits of choosing to delegate the lead for safeguarding to the Bishop's Chaplain. The Chaplain is well placed within the diocesan structures to pass information to and from the Bishop, and to and from the various management bodies. The DSA cited progress she had made engaging the area deans as an example of how the Chaplain had aided communication with a group with whom she might not otherwise have had much contact.

The DSA's photograph and contact details are easily located on the diocesan website, which makes the sharing of information with her easier.

The Parish Focus Group discussed two incidents in which information had been shared without the permission of key people. The auditors, and in some cases group members also, took the view that the information was perhaps shared appropriately, given the need for transparency in safeguarding. Indeed, the Bishop of Manchester stressed the need to 'lower the bar' about what is talked about in safeguarding, seeing secrecy as one of the barriers to doing safeguarding well. Nonetheless, there is possibly a need to explain more clearly to people what will and will not be divulged, and in what circumstances, if the group is representative of others who have been surprised by what was shared.

There is an information-sharing protocol with CCPAS covering callers to its out-of-hours service (see 2.12).

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*How to better promote a common understanding of when information sharing is required in safeguarding cases.*

## **2.14 LINKS WITH NATIONAL SAFEGUARDING TEAM**

The Diocese appears to be suitably engaged with the work of the National Safeguarding Team. Key developments, such as the use of core groups and Types A and B risk assessments are well used and understood, even where conscious decisions have been taken to use slightly different approaches, as with Type A Risk Assessments.

Case advice from the NST was sought as appropriate, as in complex cases straddling dioceses, or involving clergy.

Manchester's Director of Mission & Ministry helped the NST develop its Learning and Development framework. The Diocese has nonetheless struggled to come to terms with the demands of it (see 2.6), and the auditors were told that it appears that the NST perhaps does not understand the different challenges of a diocese training its clergy, and parishes training an ever-shifting cast of thousands of volunteers.

Some concern was also expressed about the requirement to deny Permission to Officiate (PTO) to people who could not meet the training demands due to ill health or other commitments, but who also had no intention of leading worship. The vital importance of PTO to some people's sense of identity was discussed, and it was

suggested the national church should devise a system whereby people are able to be affirmed in their priestly identity, but not able to practice if they are not suitably trained.

## **2.15 ANYTHING ELSE?**

A number of people raised the issue of bullying of clergy by members of the congregation, and the difficulty of reporting it, especially where someone is seeking a positive curacy report, for example, and is anxious about looking weak. This is not inherently a safeguarding issue, so this report does not look at it in detail, but the auditors wish to note that it did crop up, and may be something the Diocese wishes to consider.

## **3 Conclusion**

### **3.1 WHAT'S WORKING WELL?**

The DSA has done a huge amount to move safeguarding forward in her 2.5 years in post. This has been flagged up by everyone: the Bishop, archdeacons, Diocesan Secretary and Parish Focus Group. Casework and the casework management system are both sound. The auditors heard evidence of an empathic approach in circumstances that were very worrying but where nothing would be gained by taking a rigid, rule-bound approach. The DSA has developed good links with statutory agencies.

The Bishop arrived with solid safeguarding experience after many years as the Suffragan Bishop of Dudley, where he served as delegated safeguarding lead. He shows a good understanding of what makes for a strong safeguarding culture, for example 'lowering the bar', so that people talk about things instead of keeping them bottled up. The Bishop sees safeguarding as a positive aspect of ministry and not a burden. He was thoughtful and reflective in his attitude to the safeguarding agenda.

Delegating the safeguarding lead to the Bishop's Chaplain is unusual. The auditors wondered how it would work, but were reassured that people say it does, and it has some obvious benefits, such as the ease with which he can make sure information is appropriately shared. The Chaplain shares the Bishop's understanding that safeguarding works when people see it as integral to ministry, and that was a message put across by the Director of Mission & Ministry as well. The fact that the Director of Mission & Ministry leads on safeguarding training reinforces the message that safeguarding is integral.

The DSA feels well supported by the whole of Church House; safeguarding does not operate in isolation. The Diocesan Secretary has an excellent understanding of how organisations work. The DSA is also well supported by the network of Diocesan Secretary, Independent Chair of the DSP, the case discussion group and her own professional supervision.

The re-launch of the Diocesan Safeguarding Panel is in its early days but is working well to bring the right people together with a good chair. They have a strategic focus, a development plan, and ideas about how to develop a quality assurance function.

The Bishop introduced the first safeguarding newsletter in the Diocese, and this provided positive public backing for the safeguarding message.

The archdeacons communicate well about safeguarding and act as active support to the DSA.

### **3.2 WHAT NEEDS TO IMPROVE?**

The safeguarding function is significantly under-resourced, and this needs to be addressed. It is positive that the advert for a trainer/assistant has been developed, but this recruitment should be a priority now. A huge amount of progress has been made in the time that the DSA has had administrative support, and the risk of not

providing dedicated safeguarding administration is that the DSA will again get bogged down in administrative tasks.

The DSA needs to channel her committed enthusiasm to her work. She has worked on a number of cases that are disciplinary matters, rather than safeguarding. The DSA needs to feel confident in delegating more tasks.

The Chaplain role does not inherently link to parishes; the aspect of selling safeguarding to the parishes therefore needs to be thought about. When the Chaplain is in the parishes, he should be clear to people that he is there as safeguarding lead too, to maximise the opportunities to push the safeguarding agenda.

Linked to that, the archdeacons do have a key role in promoting safeguarding in the parishes. The auditors wonder whether, as part of the development of the DSP, an archdeacon should be there. The NST will ask for that, so it would be worth reflecting on whether that would be helpful.

This is particularly important, because there is a rather high number of clergy cases, and a number of clergy who are not fully understanding the priority which safeguarding is now afforded, or the benefits of getting support from the Diocese in dealing with it. Some clergy feel that they can manage everything themselves, which has implications for risk management and safer recruitment at parish level.

There is parish information being gathered in the form of an annual safeguarding return, but that does not seem to be getting to the DSP or archdeacons. More use could be made of this data for planning and case management purposes.

Parish safeguarding officers (PSOs) could benefit from more support. The auditors have heard concerns about the consistency of quality of PSOs. Approaches such as mentoring, thank you events, conferences and so forth may be helpful here. It is acknowledged that organising developments like this is not going to be possible while there is only one person in the safeguarding service.

There has been no use of the Listening Line for survivors of abuse, so some thought needs to be given to what a better offer to victims and survivors might be.

There is a huge training challenge. It is positive that there is a new person coming, and to make the most of this, a detailed action plan might usefully be in place for when they arrive.

## **APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS**

### **DATA COLLECTION**

#### **Information provided to auditors**

Prior to the audit, the Diocese supplied:

- The Diocese of Manchester's Safeguarding Policy
- Minutes of, and DSA reports to, the last four meetings of the Diocesan Safeguarding Panel
- A copy of the first diocesan safeguarding newsletter, from February 2017
- An information-sharing protocol with CCPAS relating to their out-of-hours call service
- Profiles and a map of the Diocese
- Job descriptions for the Bishop's delegated safeguarding lead, for police and probation members of the DSP, and for the DSA
- Recruitment details and job description for the Independent Chair of the DSP
- Three DSA reports to the Bishop's Leadership Team
- Details of safeguarding training availability
- Self-audit returns to the NST
- Safeguarding principles in the Diocese
- Agenda for a safeguarding study day

During the audit, the Diocese supplied:

- Safeguarding operational policy
- Details of a fact-finding visit to the Diocese of Chichester
- A training strategy update
- A safeguarding priorities update
- Further job descriptions – e.g. for youth workers
- DSA report to Bishop's Council
- Terms of Reference for the DSP

#### **Participation of members of the Diocese**

During the three-day audit, the auditors had conversations with:

- Bishop of Manchester
- Bishop's Chaplain
- Director of Mission & Ministry
- Archdeacon of Bolton
- Archdeacon of Salford
- Chair of the Diocesan Safeguarding Panel
- A curate, as parish representative on the Diocesan Safeguarding Panel
- A police representative on the Diocesan Safeguarding Panel
- Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser
- Diocesan Secretary

In addition, the auditors met a parish focus group, including two incumbent vicars, one curate, and one Parish Safeguarding Officer. Because this was unusually small (see Limitations of Audit below) the lead auditor contacted other proposed focus group members by email after the audit. One person, who supports a number of Parish Safeguarding Officers, replied.

Three Local Authority Designated Officers (LADOs) responded to requests to provide feedback on the work of the diocese.

### **The audit: what records / files were examined?**

The auditors reviewed 19 case files, of which eight related to children, seven to adults, and four which in some measure related to both. Where the safeguarding case related to clergy, the auditors looked also at the relevant clergy Blue Files. Three of the files had risk assessments, and the auditors looked at two further risk assessments.

To explore safe recruitment practices in the Diocese, the auditors looked at four lay recruitment files, and the Blue Files of four recently-recruited clergy.

## **LIMITATIONS OF AUDIT**

The Manchester Arena bomb attack occurred the night before the audit began. The Diocese, and the Bishop of Manchester, were heavily involved in the immediate response. The event seemed to have a tangible effect on the mood of the city, and the Diocese which serves it, and the auditors would like to extend their thanks to everyone involved for their generosity of time and attention, when it would have been potentially more straightforward for the Diocese to postpone the audit.

The travel disruption resulting from the attack had an impact on the number of attendees at the Parish Focus Group, but group members were contacted by email subsequently.