



social care  
institute for excellence

# **Diocese of Sodor and Man independent safeguarding audit (December 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 February 2018  
by the Social Care Institute for Excellence and the Church of England

© Church of England

All rights reserved

Written by Susan Ellery, Sally Trench 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	4
2.3	Diocesan Safeguarding Panel	6
2.4	Guidance, policies and procedures	7
2.5	Casework	7
2.6	Training	10
2.7	Safe Recruitment of clergy, lay officers and volunteers	11
2.8	Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)	12
2.9	Complaints and whistleblowing	12
2.10	Quality assurance processes	13
2.11	How diocese provides support & Monitoring of safeguarding in parishes	13
2.12	Resources for children and vulnerable adults	14
2.13	Information sharing	15
2.14	Links with National Safeguarding Team	15
<b>3</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1	What's working well	16
3.2	Areas for further development	16
	<b>APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>DATA COLLECTION</b>	<b>18</b>
	Limitations of audit	18

# 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 the safeguarding journey of the diocese to date and to support the continuing improvements being made. Following pilot audits of four dioceses in 2015, an agreed audit model was applied nationally from 2016.

The audit of the Diocese of Sodor and Man was carried out by Susan Ellery (the lead auditor for this diocese) and Sally Trench on 12, 13 and 14 December 2017.

The audit process incorporated an examination of files and documents, along with meetings with key individuals and a Focus Group of chaplaincy representatives. Details of the process are provided in the appendix.

This report was written by Susan Ellery with support from Sally Trench and quality assurance provided by Edi Carmi, the senior auditing lead.

## 1.2 THE DIOCESE

The Diocese of Sodor and Man is, by far, the smallest diocese in the Church of England by area and population. It is also one of the oldest, dating back to 1154.

The Diocese has 15 parishes, with 42 churches and chapels, and 36 ordained clergy. Fifteen of the clergy are full-time, stipendiary and the others are part-time, occasional and/or self-supporting. Twenty-eight lay readers support the ordained clergy.

In 2009, the Diocese abolished rural deaneries and established four mission partnerships. Its aim is to promote the mission of the Church in its district, and to promote community and cooperation among those parishes.

The Bishop of Sodor and Man is a member of the Legislative Council and thus sits in Tynwald when it sits with the elected House of Keys to form the joint parliament of the island. The Isle of Man is a crown dependency and not part of the UK.

The Diocese of Sodor and Man and its clergy are subject to the Canons of the Church of England. The various Measures, Rules and Guidelines issued by General Synod do not always automatically apply to the Isle of Man and some are discretionary. All have to be adapted before they can be adopted, a procedure which involves the Diocese's own Legislative Committee, its Diocesan Synod and the Ecclesiastical Committee of Tynwald.

The Diocese has a cathedral, which does not receive central funding from the Church of England. Most of the clergy hold multiple roles, often at different levels in the Church hierarchy (e.g. archdeacon and parish vicar). There is no diocesan office, and people who might be expected to work from a diocesan office, e.g. the Diocesan Secretary and Diocesan Treasurer, work from home part-time.

### 1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The structure of the report is as follows:

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: The Findings of the auditors: the auditors have made links with the S. 11 (Children Act 2004) audit form completed by the Diocese in preparation for the audit.
- Considerations for the Diocese are listed, where relevant, under each finding in section 2: the term 'considerations' instead of recommendations is used in the SCIE Learning Together methodology – the reason for this is that whilst some considerations will be around taking specific types of action, others relate to best practice outcomes, but the way to achieve these differ from place to place – in the latter circumstances the Diocese will need to consider the specific actions to be taken.
- Section 3: Conclusions providing an overview of what is working well, what needs to work better and a summary of considerations for the Diocese.
- Appendix, providing detail of the methodology along with any limitations of the audit.

## **2 FINDINGS**

### **2.1 SAFEGUARDING MANAGEMENT**

#### **2.1.1 Leadership**

The Bishop is very new to Sodor and Man, and was installed just three months before the audit. His previous experience was primarily in the British Army. He experienced at first hand the changes made to the military culture in the aftermath of four deaths of young soldiers at Deepcut in Surrey, between 1995 and 2002. He is also aware of the potential individual and institutional trauma in an organisation such as he saw in the Army and expects to see in the Church of England as a result of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse.

The Bishop explained that, as the Diocese is very small, it has a much flatter structure than most and he has a more immediate relationship with his parish clergy than many bishops would be able to have. This must be even more so given that senior clerics, such as the Archdeacon and the Dean, are also parish vicars. The advantage is that he is much more accessible and the flat, small structure gives an agility whereby decisions can be made and action taken quickly. It also means that his decision-making is more open to question and the auditors saw evidence of that in relation to the previous Bishop. The advantages and disadvantages of working on a small island became a feature of this audit. People know each other, most people have several roles or paid jobs, and most members of congregations have been there for a long time, if not life, whereas most clergy and officers have moved to the island from the UK.

Communication is fast, it is hard to hide a secret, communities support each other and there is a high degree of cooperation between agencies. On the other hand, there is the potential for collusion; professional practice in statutory agencies may be behind or follow a different course from the UK and it may be hard to challenge other agencies for poor performance.

Within the Church of England, the auditors found a small senior team that shares a determination to improve safeguarding in order to be sure that churches are safe and welcoming places.

The Bishop delegates the lead for safeguarding to the Sector Minister – Education, Families, Children & Young People who is also a Team Rector, a Mission Partnership Team Leader and a Canon of the Cathedral. He reported that his actual involvement had been primarily in training with the assistant DSA, until the retirement of the previous DSA.

The Diocesan Secretary has the lead for working with other denominations to establish an ecumenical post of Safeguarding Adviser (see 2.5) and for resourcing the post.

#### **2.1.2 Links with Cathedral**

The Cathedral does not operate as most cathedrals do. The Archdeacon, and not the Dean, is second in the hierarchy of the Diocese and both have multiple jobs. The office of Dean was re-established in 2011 after a lapse of over a hundred years, during which time the Bishop was also the Dean.

The Cathedral was consecrated in 1980, after the sale of Bishopscourt where the chapel had served as a pro-cathedral. It was previously a parish church and continues to be part of a Mission Partnership rather than standing alone from the Diocese.

As a result, links between the Cathedral and the rest of the Diocese are very strong, including for safeguarding. The Cathedral has a Parish Safeguarding Officer.

The Cathedral Choir comprises boys and girls drawn from local schools. The last organ scholar also did outreach, providing music sessions in local schools that resulted in a performance at the Cathedral.

### 2.1.3 Culture

The auditors heard from a range of people, clergy and lay, that the culture of safeguarding is under-developed. This is further discussed in 2.11.

The deficit in understanding was explained by the Dean as people needing to realise that safeguarding is in place to help them and not to 'get them'.

*(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 how the new ecumenical safeguarding structures (see 2.2 and 2.3) can promote a greater awareness, and acceptance, of the need for safeguarding and its purpose.*

## 2.2 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISER/S

The post of Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser (DSA) was vacant at the time of the audit. A DSA in the north east of England was providing remote cover as and when required in a freelance capacity. She told the auditors that she had been contacted by the Diocese about a vulnerable adult and the action taken had been appropriate.

The previous DSA was also a part-time vicar of a parish and paid an additional day a week for safeguarding. Her safeguarding experience was gained in her pre-ordination career in the police, including at Inspector level. The previous DSA retired from the role in summer 2017. The auditors were concerned that the joint role had contained a potential conflict of interest, and in one case seen, an actual conflict of interest. The difficulties of the joint role issue had been raised by the previous DSA and acted upon by the diocesan management in formulating plans for her replacement.

The Diocese employs an assistant DSA for four hours a week. Her primary focus is training although at present, alongside the Bishop's delegated lead for safeguarding, she is the first point of contact for safeguarding queries.

The Diocese has been working with an ecumenical group, Churches Alive In Mann (CAIM), towards the appointment of an Ecumenical Safeguarding Adviser and Coordinator (ESAC). CAIM brings together the Anglican, Methodist and Roman Catholic churches plus Living Hope, an evangelical community church.



This partnership working, and the consequent sharing of resources, will enable the appointment to be full-time and salaried. A job description and person specification were ready, and provided in a pack on the ecumenical initiative for the auditors. The auditors' view was that, despite the challenges in establishing, managing and supporting the ESAC post, it makes sense for the Isle of Man and brings useful opportunities for a shared approach and for raising the quality of safeguarding in each denomination to the level of the best.

The ESAC post will be supervised by the Senior Independent Reviewing Officer (equivalent to a Local Authority Designated Officer in England). This should provide strong links into Children's Services and a secular input. The auditors wondered whether it might be supportive for the ESAC if they are physically based in Children's Services as it could be quite an isolated and/or exposed post.

The previous DSA had had a close working relationship with the island's Chief Social Worker, who is now Director of Children's Services. The DSA frequently sought advice and always followed it.

The ESAC's employer will be CAIM and this will be a new departure for the group. The Diocesan Secretary reported that much was still to be worked out about pension, management, etc. CAIM will also need to consider how to manage the performance of the ESAC, and how the supervisor will contribute to annual appraisal.

The ESAC post will be joint-funded by the members of CAIM. An application will also been made to Children's Services for grant funding for the future development and expansion of the initiative. The Director of Children's Services told the auditors that grant funding would be dependent on an acceptable performance framework for the post, as a commissioned service.

The ESAC post will be advertised via CAIM and via national networks for each denomination. Should the preferred candidate not be an islander, a work permit will then be needed, as for any other post.

It was not possible to take a view about whether the ESAC post will be able to provide sufficient resources, along with the four-hour-a-week assistant post. Although the hours worked will be significantly increased, the spread of responsibility over four denominations will also be much greater.

*(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**

*Consider what suitable working arrangements (location, supervision, etc.) the ECAS will require.*

## 2.3 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING PANEL

The Diocese does not have a Diocesan Safeguarding Panel (DSP) and the Diocese acknowledges that it needs either a panel or a means to meet the requirements of a panel as set out in national policy and practice guidance.

One option would be for CAIM to develop into an ecumenical safeguarding panel. There is currently a CAIM Ecumenical Safeguarding Initiative Implementation Group (CESIIG), which is setting up and appointing to the post of ESAC (see 2.2 above). The intention is for the group to continue and it could agree a Terms of Reference by which all four denominations hold themselves to account for safeguarding. For Anglicans, this means complying with section 2.4 of the practice guidance Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance, 2017. Much would depend on whether the other denominations can support section 2.4 or have equivalent practice guidance.

Another option is for CAIM to provide the faith representation on the island's Safeguarding Board (at present Adults and Children have separate boards but legislation expected in 2018 will join them). CAIM, and the Church of England as a member of CAIM, would then be held to account for safeguarding in the same way other members agencies are.

A third option is for the current Safeguarding Development Steering Group to acquire an Independent Chair and become a Diocesan Safeguarding Panel. At present the group includes the Diocesan Secretary, the Bishop's Chaplain, the Bishop's delegated lead for safeguarding, the DSA (were one in post) and the assistant DSA. The SDSG created a multi-faceted Safeguarding Development Plan in 2016, and throughout 2017 developed, monitored and implemented the plan's activities. Recently the main focus of the group has been primarily to put in place interim arrangements between the former DSA retiring and the new ESAC post being appointed and to prepare for this audit.

These options are not mutually exclusive as the second option could co-exist with and compliment the first and third options.

The Diocese will need to decide what is the best aspirational solution, and this might mean a more short-term solution, such as changing the role of the Development Steering Group while CAIM develops and matures, for example.

*(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 how best to move towards meeting the requirements of Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance, 2017 in relation to a diocesan safeguarding panel.*

## 2.4 GUIDANCE, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The Diocese does not have its own guidance, policies or procedures. The diocesan website page on safeguarding has a link to the Church of England policy statement, Promoting a Safer Church, 2017. A further, embedded, link takes you to the Church of England website safeguarding page, which then provides a link to policy and practice guidance. This link takes you to a statement about policy and practice guidance, which contains further links to each policy and practice guidance document, via Access Policy and Practice Guidance.

In practice, six clicks are required between the front page of the diocesan website and any specific national policy or practice guidance. This would seem to be over complicated and it might be better to have direct access to each national policy or practice guidance on the diocesan safeguarding page.

In addition, the Church of England statement about policy and practice guidance includes the sub-statement, 'The Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 applies to the whole of the provinces of Canterbury and York (including the Diocese in Europe subject to local variations/modifications), with the exception of the Channel Islands and Sodor and Man. In order to extend the 2016 Measure to the Channel Islands or Sodor and Man, legislation will need to be passed by the relevant island jurisdictions in accordance with section 12 of that Measure'. It is unclear on the Sodor and Man website whether such legislation has been passed and this might be generally confusing to a lay person.

Safeguarding policy and practice guidance is fully endorsed by the Bishop and adopted by the Diocesan Synod but there is no indication of the Synod's adoption nor Bishop's affirmation on the website.

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

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*Consider how to make the links on the diocesan website to national policy and practice guidance as simple to use as possible.*

*Consider whether a statement by the Bishop and adoption by Diocesan Synod would give weight to the policy and practice guidance in use.*

## 2.5 CASEWORK

A feature of this Diocese was a lack of case records to review. A total of eight were audited, three of which concerned a child or children and five of which concerned an adult deemed to be vulnerable due to mental health problems or old age/infirmity, other than one case in which the reason for vulnerability was not stated.

### 2.5.1 Quality of response to allegations

Two cases were anonymous. One of these was a complaint about the behaviour of a

church volunteer towards a child rather than a safeguarding referral, and the child's identity did not need to be known. The other concerned several siblings and, although preliminary enquiries allayed concerns, it would have been good practice to record at least the family name in case of future concerns.

Most, but not all, records had a front sheet with the basic information about the referral. Sometimes the role of the referrer was not given. On one front sheet, the word 'incident' had been mistyped as 'indecent', and it took the auditor some time to realise that the case was much less serious than it initially seemed. Most case records actually consisted primarily of emails. Cases were not closed, with reasons for closure, but petered out. Overall, recording seemed to reflect the fact that the previous DSA had had little time to do it given that she was employed in this capacity for one day a week.

Where the front sheet was complete, the cases seen showed a reasonable timescale for response. Other agencies were appropriately referred to and involved.

The auditors were interested to see that most cases concerned vulnerable adults. There was a view among the clergy involved in the audit that congregations on the island tend to be elderly. One case showed sensitive working with community volunteers where an elderly person was highly resistant to accepting help.

There was some confusion about what is a safeguarding referral and what is a complaint. In one case, a complaint about the treatment of a child was recorded as safeguarding although actually treated as a complaint, but with the DSA involved 'to take notes'.

In one very concerning case involving an adult, the auditors were critical of the actions of a member of clergy and of statutory agencies. This case might have benefitted from an independent review although, for maximum learning, it would need to be a multi-agency review. However, there remains a need to learn from this case.

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

There were no risk assessments or safeguarding agreements to be reviewed. One case should have had a risk assessment, even though the risk was low. It concerned a failure to follow correct procedure at work (outside the church). It was clear that the DSA in another diocese, about to receive the person in question, was very frustrated by the fact that Sodor and Man were not adhering to practice guidance.

There were no known offenders worshipping in churches on the island, who should have been subject to risk assessment and safeguarding agreements.

No core group records were reviewed by the auditors. However, a core group had been called by the previous DSA in one case that covers several dioceses. This core group was chaired by the Director of Children's Services and involved an appropriate range of people. In addition, the DSA organised a multi-diocesan core group in the UK. The case referred to above (where auditors critical of actions of a member of clergy) might have benefitted from a core group approach but had been dealt with through a Clergy Disciplinary Measure.

### 2.5.3 Recording systems

All records are currently on paper. One of the challenges for the ESAC post will be to decide how best to record and it may be that, if there is a risk of four separate electronic systems, paper records will work better.

Whatever system is used, recording in the future will need to be stored securely and to be accessible to those who need access.

The previous DSA was provided with a dedicated laptop for safeguarding recording, and a separate email account. She had to take responsibility for storing safeguarding records, in the absence of a diocesan office. This needs to change, to protect confidentiality and to provide secure storage of records.

### 2.5.4 Any other issues arising in casework?

The legislative framework on the Isle of Man is not the same as in the UK. The Director of Children's Services told the auditors that, although it is very similar to the Children Act 1989, there is not yet a duty to safeguard on all statutory agencies, making the framework like the UK before the Children Act 2004. This should change in the spring of 2018, when legislation is expected to bring the Isle of Man in line with the Children Act 2004.

The auditors were told that, prior to 2014, there were no statutory requirements for safeguarding arrangements for adults and although Social Services officers instigated initial developments, the concept of adult safeguarding is still quite a recent innovation.

The auditors saw a couple of signs that some professionals may sometimes act in a way that would now be unusual or not tolerated in the UK. This is not a criticism of the current Director of Children's Services, who talked about the work she has initiated to raise professional standards in her department. It does mean that the DSA must be very sure of their own professional standards and be ready to challenge people in statutory services if they fall short.

There is a positive aspect to the size of the island, in that people across statutory agencies know each other and respond quickly.

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

*Consider how to maintain effective recording of casework to ensure confidentiality and provide secure storage of records.*

*Consider how to enable the ESAC to undertake risk assessments and lead safeguarding agreements, consistent with Church of England guidance.*

*Consider what arrangements and supports needs to be in place to enable the ESAC to initiate a core group, should one be needed, including protocols about who should be involved and how to work round conflicts of interest in a small diocese.*

*Consider, in consultation with the National Safeguarding Team (NST), how to enable diocesan learning from the case the auditors were critical about and consider if there remains a need to respond further to the family's concerns.*

## 2.6 TRAINING

### 2.6.1 Delivery

Safeguarding training is currently delivered by the assistant DSA and the Bishop's delegated lead for safeguarding. The training offer is good, given the size of the Diocese, and includes S1 (Safer Recruitment) and S3 (Domestic Abuse) as well as the core courses.

The core course C0 is delivered online, and the Parish Focus Group reported that groups or whole congregations sometimes do it together, before those who are eligible attend C1 and C2. This approach was found to be productive.

The diocesan website sets out the dates for training, but does not advise who should attend which training and how often. This information might be useful.

The Diocese does not have a training strategy but training is an integral part of the diocesan Safeguarding Development Plan, which is updated three monthly. This plan has ensured safeguarding is integrated into the Continuous Ministerial Development training programme.

The Bishop attends almost all training, to provide affirmation.

There was a comment in the Focus Group about having had to attend three different courses in five years, due to changes in the course content. This was due to requirements from All Saints Training Centre for Mission and Ministry. They did not accept the Combined Methodist training and the Pilot C of E training (SG), and so ordinands had to repeat training at C1 and C2 level, and then do C3 almost immediately, as they were licensed within weeks of doing C2. One person had to attend safeguarding training in four different roles (albeit not just in the C of E), as a volunteer, and found this onerous. Another said that the different denominations were moving away from validating each other's training, which can cause problems in a place where ecumenical working is strong. Hope was expressed that ecumenical safeguarding training could be developed, and this would seem to be a sensible path in the context of the ESAC role.

Overall, the consensus in the Focus Group was that training is a bit of a burden, and something that must be done, although the quality of the material and delivery has improved.

Resistance among volunteers to training and to Safer Recruitment (see 2.7 below) was reported by the Focus Group. One comment was that even people who had high-profile jobs in the UK before retiring to the Isle of Man sometimes refuse to believe that safeguarding could be an issue.

The auditors were not told of clerical resistance to training, perhaps due to the involvement of the Bishop's delegated lead and the Bishop.

Clergy with Permission to Officiate (PtO) who are currently active are all trained. If their training lapses their PTO is not now renewed until their training is up to date.

The assistant DSA keeps records of who has been trained and who is due for refresher training.

*(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**

*Consider whether CAIM could lead on the provision of ecumenical safeguarding training in the future.*

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

Unexpectedly, owing to time constraints, the auditors were able to review only three clergy Blue Files for evidence of Safer Recruitment, and one of these dated back to 2013. In such a constricted pool of clergy, there were also not many Blue Files to choose from.

The most recent appointment had a table in the front of the file, to record the DBS check and safeguarding training.

The two recent appointments have application forms, proof of identity and a Current Clergy Status Letter (CCSL) where appropriate. A very recent appointment did not have reference on file but that may have been pending.

Overall, evidence of the Safer Recruitment of clergy was satisfactory.

The Diocese employs only one lay officer, a youth and children's worker at the Cathedral, and his HR file was neither seen nor requested by the auditors.

The Focus Group reported that the Safer Recruitment of volunteers can be problematic, with one person saying, 'We're a long way behind'. The consensus was that Safer Recruitment is viable for new recruits but not for existing volunteers, and that the requirement for two references was the sticking point. Links were made to the small size and relatively older average ages of congregations, as well as the fact that people usually know each other and that it is hard to keep a secret on the island.

*(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**

*Consider how to implement the Safer Recruitment of volunteers across all posts, existing and future.*

## 2.8 DISCLOSURE AND BARRING SERVICE (DBS)

The auditors were told that clergy DBS checks were in the past processed by the Diocese of York. Now all DBS checks are done through the Isle of Man Government DBS Bureau with no issues reported.

Lay DBS checks are processed by the Manx government, and it was reported by the Focus Group that the person responsible for processing the checks is very helpful in terms of framing the request so that the reason for the request is clear.

Timescales are not generally a problem, with DBS checks for people who have lived on the island for five or more years taking only a week. DBS checks for relative newcomers may take longer, and two months seems to be the average waiting time.

The auditors were not made aware of any referrals to DBS in the last four years and did not see any cases where a referral should have been made.

## 2.9 COMPLAINTS AND WHISTLEBLOWING

The Diocese currently has no formal written complaints or whistleblowing policy. Trainees on safeguarding courses are informed on how to act if there is a need to complain.

The Diocese employs an HR officer for two days a month, and she is revising the Staff Handbook. The new version will include both complaints and whistleblowing, as they work under Manx law. The auditors suggested that they be made available on the diocesan website as well.

The auditors reviewed a case in which a complaint had been made, and felt that it was not dealt with as well as it might have been (see 2.5.1). It was also unclear whether the recommendations had been acted on. The complaints policy might set out clearly how a complaint will be dealt with, in what timescales, and how learning from complaints will be put into practice and monitored. This would apply to any complaint and not only complaints about the conduct of a safeguarding case.

*(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**

*Agree policies for complaints (generally as well as complaints about the conduct of safeguarding officers or the processes) and whistleblowing, and make sure they are easily accessible via the website.*

*Consider how the learning from complaints can lead to changes and how such changes can be checked and monitored.*



## 2.10 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

In the absence of a diocesan safeguarding panel that is confident in its role in quality assurance, the processes are at an early stage and lack coordination.

A diocesan self-audit by parishes was initiated in 2015 and repeated in 2017. The DSA sent out a pro-forma to the parishes, and the Parish Safeguarding Officers (PSOs) attended a meeting with the DSA, the Bishop's delegated lead for safeguarding and the Archdeacon. The PSOs brought evidence of booklets and policies, and of how they were shared within the parish.

The DSA and Archdeacon drew up a list of actions for each parish. The Archdeacon noted that there were far fewer actions resulting from the 2017 audit and that every parish had made progress in safeguarding. The auditors read a sample of the self-audits and thought that the 2017 audit showed signs of learning from the 2015 audit, and that overall this is a useful process and should continue to develop. At present, the information from the self-audit is not collated in an effective form.

The Diocese completes the annual National Safeguarding Team self-audit form. The auditors did not see evidence of any use of external scrutiny of processes or of cases, or of a system to pull out and use any learning from complex cases, complaints, etc.

Other than the processes above, the Diocese lacks the structure and staffing necessary to implement a system of quality assurance for safeguarding.

### **Considerations for the Diocese**

*Consider how to quality assure safeguarding processes and casework, including how the new ecumenical arrangements will support this.*

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

### 2.11.1 Archdeacon's responsibilities

There is one archdeacon in the Diocese, and he is also the vicar of a parish and chairs the Diocesan Board of Finance.

The Archdeacon has not conducted Articles of Enquiry and did not inherit an expectation that he would, although he had not ruled them out.

The Archdeacon explained that the Visitation works differently on the island, in that church wardens are sworn in annually by the (lay) Vicar-General and not by him. He does lead the act of worship at which the swearing-in takes place.

The Archdeacon does an in-depth Visitation to two or three parishes a year, examining a range of responsibilities, including safeguarding.

## 2.11.2 SUPPORT GIVEN TO PARISH SAFEGUARDING OFFICERS

Every parish has a Parish Safeguarding Officer. The view of the Parish Focus Group was that the job could be a 'poisoned chalice', due to resistance to believing that safeguarding could be an issue on the Isle of Man (prevalent in relative newcomers as much as Manx people). However, members of the group also felt that, although the island is 'not there yet', progress is being made and in about seven years the Diocese has had to make a bigger leap than many others.

In terms of ongoing support, in the last 12 months there have been three meetings to which all PSOs were invited. These were to inform them of changes at both national and local level. Two were run by the previous DSA and minutes of those meetings were available to the auditors and one by the Assistant DSA post the previous DSA's retirement. Another one is planned after the audit. The Bishop's Safeguarding lead is also involved in supporting PSOs in this way as well as through the training programme

## 2.12 RESOURCES FOR CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS

### 2.12.1 Responding to victims/survivors

There is no network or commissioning of Authorised Listeners in the Diocese. However, given the close working relationship between the Diocese and Children's and Adults Services, the DSA can and has referred to statutory authorities and their voluntary sector agents.

The auditors did not review any cases in which a victim or a survivor asked for a listening or a counselling service, or in which they thought that a service should have been offered. This does not mean that such a scenario will not happen in the future.

### 2.12.2 Proactive efforts to create a safe culture

The Diocese has one salaried Youth and Children's Officer, who is based at the Cathedral, and works in close partnership with the Scripture Union which funds similar posts in schools.

The profile of referrals suggests that the vulnerable elderly are a higher risk than children and young people. The Parish Focus Group thought that there is a growing realisation that safeguarding is about adults as well as children and that the majority of a congregation might be older people many of whom may be vulnerable in some aspects of their life. One person reported a conversation about an older person needing help to organise their finances, and the question of whether they were providing help as a friend or as a church officer. This suggests that further thought is needed in this area.

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

*Consider how best to further create a safe culture so that all ages feel safe and welcome in churches across the Diocese.*

## **2.13 INFORMATION SHARING**

Information sharing within the Diocese works well, partly because it is a small place. The auditors did not see any situations where they would have expected the DSA to be informed and she had not been.

Information sharing with external agencies also works well, with most people being on first name terms. The less helpful aspect of this familiarity was noticed in the casework (see 2.5.1), when challenge to a statutory agency that had not functioned well was limited.

Information sharing with other denominations seems to work well at present and will only improve when the ESAC post is filled.

There are vulnerabilities around the storage of information given that there is no central storage of information as there is no diocesan office. See 2.5.3 above. However the issue of files being kept in the former DSA's vicarage has been rectified by securing them in the office of the Bishop's PA.

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

The National Safeguarding Team (NST) is viewed as supportive and as showing an understanding of the particular problems faced by the Diocese. The National Safeguarding Adviser has been involved in scoping the ESAC post.

Sodor and Man, given its significantly smaller staff resources than other dioceses, has found it difficult to respond to all requests for information from the NST. It has had to prioritise 'must do' items e.g. calls for information for the national Inquiry over the 'like to do' e.g. consultation on potential new procedures.

## 3 Conclusion

This section provides the headline findings from the audit, drawing out positives and the areas for development. The detail behind these appraisals are in the Findings in section 2.

### 3.1 WHAT'S WORKING WELL

- Everyone seen by the auditors recognises that the Diocese is on a journey in relation to safeguarding, which started around the time of the previous Bishop's arrival in 2008, and that there is some distance to go. There is a commitment to further change and improvement, and this is illustrated, e.g. in the strategic plans for ecumenical developments.
- The Bishop is new and has firm intentions about what he wants to improve, including safeguarding. He has experience of safeguarding issues, and is clear about his leadership role.
- All the members of the Bishop's Leadership Team seen by the auditors showed a similarly high level of commitment to safeguarding and a good knowledge base.
- The Diocese is close to creating, with partners, the ESAC post. The challenges are very real but the amount of thought and work that has gone into this promises very well. This seems to be a brave plan, and a sensible one.
- Training is going well, and core and additional training have been implemented. There is appreciation for the enthusiasm and skill of the trainers. Having a member of the clergy paired with a lay trainer helps in many ways, including tackling resistance.
- Whole parish or open invitation training for C0 is an idea that has worked well in a number of churches, and helps with the culture change they want to achieve.
- The Cathedral has thought about the need to proactively safeguard the choristers.
- There is a good working relationship with the Director of Children's Services, and she foresees an ongoing role in supporting the new ESAC.
- A safeguarding audit for parishes has been used twice, and the auditors could see improvement in the method and response between 2015 and 2017.

### 3.2 AREAS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

- The task of embedding a new culture is a challenging one, especially in circumstances where many people have known each other for years or even moved to the island in the belief that safeguarding would not be an issue there.
- The lack of budget makes all decisions very difficult, given that almost everything involves money.
- The lack of a diocesan infrastructure adds a level of complexity and is a potential barrier to progress.

- Case recording and case management are at very basic levels and it was difficult to make a reliable judgment about the quality of the casework, because the recording was so variable.
- There is a need for a case management system – either electronic or paper-based – which would support good recording and a more rigorous approach to practice.

## **APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS**

### **DATA COLLECTION**

#### **Information provided to auditors before the audit**

- Agenda for CAIM working group 30 October 2017
- Agenda for Safeguarding Development Planning Group 16 June 2017
- Membership of diocesan committees 2017
- Briefing paper on the Diocese of Sodor and Man
- Safeguarding SWOT analysis 2016
- Updates on the development plan for safeguarding resulting from the SWOT analysis x 4
- Diocesan self-assessment 2015 and 2016

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

The auditors had conversations with:

- The Bishop of Sodor and Man
- The Archdeacon of Man
- The Dean of the Cathedral
- The Bishop's delegated lead for safeguarding
- The Diocesan Secretary
- The assistant DSA
- The HR Officer
- The Director of Children's Services

Auditors also spoke by phone to the freelance DSA from another diocese who is providing remote back-up in the interim between former DSA retiring and ESAC being appointed.

A Parish Focus Group was held and included seven people with a range of roles across the Diocese. The auditors agreed not to name the roles as, in such a small diocese, it might lead to the identification of the individual and their anonymity was agreed.

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

The auditors reviewed eight case records and three clergy Blue Files.

### **LIMITATIONS OF AUDIT**

There were no known limitations to the audit.