



social care
institute for excellence

Diocese of Winchester independent safeguarding audit (October 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 January 2018
by the Social Care Institute for Excellence and the Church of England

© Church of England

All rights reserved

Written by Lucy Erber, Susan Ellery, Hugh Constant 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



Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Context	1
1.2	The Diocese	1
1.3	Structure of the report	2
2	FINDINGS	3
2.1	Safeguarding management	3
2.2	Diocesan Safeguarding Manager & Safeguarding Advisers	4
2.3	Diocesan Safeguarding Panel	6
2.4	Guidance, policies and procedures	8
2.5	Casework	8
2.6	Training	10
2.7	Safe Recruitment of clergy, lay officers and volunteers	11
2.8	Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)	11
2.9	Complaints and whistleblowing	11
2.10	Quality assurance processes	12
2.11	How diocese provides support & Monitoring of safeguarding in parishes	12
2.12	Resources for children and vulnerable adults	13
2.13	Information sharing	13
2.14	Links with National Safeguarding Team	14
3	CONCLUSION	15
3.1	What is working well?	15
3.2	Areas for consideration	15
	APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS	17
	DATA COLLECTION	17
	Limitations of audit	17

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 was applied nationally from 2016.

The audit of the Diocese of Winchester was carried out by Lucy Erber (the lead auditor for this diocese) and Susan Ellery from 17 to 19 October 2017. 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 Lucy Erber, with support from Susan Ellery. Quality assurance was provided by Hugh Constant, and Edi Carmi, the senior auditing lead.

There were no significant limitations to the audit.

1.2 THE DIOCESE

The Diocese of Winchester is broadly co-terminus with the county of Hampshire. Parts of the county fall within the Portsmouth and Guildford dioceses, and the Winchester Diocese includes the unitary authority of Bournemouth and part of east Dorset. It is a varied and diverse community, with some significant areas of affluence, and deprivation. Rural and coastal areas attract holidaymakers, and farming remains a significant part of the economy, whilst Southampton and Basingstoke are the largest urban areas within the Diocese. The overall population is 1.3 million and 30,000 people per week attend a church in the Diocese.

There are 261 parishes (divided into 13 deaneries) and 350 churches. The diocesan offices are in Old Alresford and Winchester at Wolvesey, which is in close proximity to Winchester Cathedral.

The current Bishop of Winchester was appointed in 2011 and is assisted by the Suffragan Bishop of Southampton and the Suffragan Bishop of Basingstoke.

The Diocese shares some of its business functions with several adjoining dioceses, in order to increase the level and quality of their service provision. The Diocese has also established Winchester Social Enterprise (WSE). Part of its social provision operates through the Good Neighbours Network (GNN) which is made up of 120 independent local good neighbours groups, and is run in partnership with Portsmouth Diocese. The groups undertake simple non-nursing tasks such as taking people to health appointments, befriending those who are lonely, and simple DIY tasks. The work is funded by Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and the NHS. GNN supplies groups with advice, Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, insurance, training (some via e-learning) and peer support.

The Safeguarding Team consists of a Safeguarding Manager working full time, supported by two Safeguarding Advisers, both working 20 hours per week on a consultancy basis. Business support is delivered by a part-time administrator, who also runs the DBS process. In its current (2016) annual return to the National Safeguarding Team it shows that 48 new referrals were received, 19 regarding a child and 29 regarding a vulnerable adult.

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

This report is divided into:

- Introduction
- An overview of what is working well, what needs to work better and a summary of considerations for the Diocese.
- 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 section.
- Limitations of the audit

2 FINDINGS

2.1 SAFEGUARDING MANAGEMENT

The Bishop of Winchester sees safeguarding to be central to the work of the Church and the Diocese, the highest of priorities, and he takes ultimate responsibility for it. He has been involved at a national level in developing safeguarding guidance and policy. The Bishop will not renew Permission to Officiate (PtO) without safeguarding training being undertaken.

In 2015 the Chief Executive commissioned Hampshire County Council to conduct a review of safeguarding within the Diocese; the review was undertaken by senior officers from adults' and children's services. Following a review of the recommendations by a Bishop's Council working group, Bishop's Council approved proposals for restructuring the Safeguarding Team and developing revised working practices.

The Bishop respects the knowledge and professionalism of the Safeguarding Manager and the Safeguarding Panel, and would be guided by their thinking. He believes their role is to challenge the Diocese on their safeguarding activity, and he welcomes this challenge.

The Chief Executive of the Diocese is the Bishop's delegated lead for safeguarding. He is also a member of Hampshire Local Safeguarding Children Board. The Safeguarding Manager is currently line managed by the Head of Operations. Line management responsibility is shortly to change, with the Head of Human Resources (HR) about to take this on.

The Bishop has very regular contact with the Safeguarding Manager, and she also confirmed that she is able to speak/meet with the Bishop whenever she needs to. However, there are not regular planned meetings, which the auditors felt, for a consistent approach, should be considered.

The Safeguarding Panel holds the Diocese to account for its safeguarding activity. It is chaired by an Independent Chair who is a former senior ranking police officer. The Panel's membership includes senior officers from local authority adults' and children's services, and the police.

The Safeguarding Panel has just developed a strategic plan, and to ensure it is fully embedded into the Diocese it is to be presented (and will be annually, going forward) to Bishop's Council.

The Channel Islands fall under the Ordinary jurisdiction of the Bishop of Winchester. Following disclosures made by a member of the Church there, significant safeguarding interventions were made by the Diocese, following which the Bishop of Winchester asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to make temporary arrangements for the pastoral care of the islands (including the oversight of safeguarding) to be provided by the Diocese of Canterbury. In 2014, this responsibility was assumed by the Bishop of Dover, who acts as an Assistant Bishop to the Bishop of Winchester. The audit did not consider these events, but it was inevitable that what took place came into conversations held during the time spent on site at the Diocese.

Senior members of the Church and diocesan officers reflected that they had spent many hours dealing with the situation that arose. They spoke of a genuine wish to 'get it right' and to put safeguarding at the centre of the decision-making, and of how this commitment had shaped the actions they had taken.

As the Bishop's nominated lead, the Chief Executive ensures that safeguarding is central to all diocesan activity. There are close working relationships between the Safeguarding Team and all diocesan functions. Management oversight has moved from Operations to Human Resources to ensure easier joint working between a number of interrelated HR and safeguarding work areas.

Articles of Enquiry have not been undertaken for the past two years. The view is that if any form of information is required from the parishes, they are simply asked. New technology, such as Survey Monkey, makes gathering information in this way relatively easy. The Diocese has just started to do annual Parish Safeguarding audits. These are being led by the Safeguarding Manager and there has been a response rate of around 70 per cent of parishes, to date. This is a good response rate for a voluntary exercise, but the auditors feel consideration needs to be made as to how to gather this information from all parishes, and to consider how the information gathered can be utilised to improve safeguarding at parish level.

There are close working relationships with the Cathedral. The Safeguarding Team takes referrals from the Cathedral and undertake any required safeguarding work as and when required. The Cathedral is also represented on the Safeguarding Panel.

Safeguarding information is on the diocesan website and members of the Focus Group said that this was where they regularly referred to for information. However, it was acknowledged to the auditors that there are recognised issues with the diocesan website and that a new website is currently being developed.

(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 a regular, diarised meeting between the Safeguarding Manager and the Bishop.

Consider new ways to gather safeguarding information from parishes, and how to evaluate findings to ensure improvements in safeguarding are the result.

2.2 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING MANAGER & SAFEGUARDING ADVISORS

There is one Safeguarding Manager employed by the Diocese who works full time. She is supported by two part-time Safeguarding Advisers, both of whom work 20 hours per week on a consultancy basis (although this can vary depending on the needs of the service). An administrator provides support to the team and oversees the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) process, on a part-time basis. This means that a total of 100 hours per week are dedicated to safeguarding, which are also added to, when required, by the sessional employment of a trainer.

All members of the Safeguarding Team are relatively new in post, although the Safeguarding Manager was a member of the previous Safeguarding Panel. The Safeguarding Manager has undertaken her role for the past 16 months and the Safeguarding Advisers for a slightly shorter period. There was no handover period for the Safeguarding Manager, who said that much of her time has been spent 'playing catch up' and in gathering information from an electronic system that was hard to navigate for someone who came to it without any explanation or handover.

There is a job description and person specification in place for the Safeguarding Manager role, but not for the Safeguarding Adviser roles.

The Safeguarding Manager is well qualified for her role, having held senior positions as a police officer within Hampshire Constabulary for many years. Her roles included working in a police child protection team, and after retirement MAPPA (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements) Coordinator working for Hampshire Police and Hampshire Probation Service.

Both Safeguarding Advisers are former police officers who have many years of experience serving in the police force. One has a background in public protection, management of offenders and child protection, and the other was the senior investigating officer on the historic abuse team and major crime department.

There is no social work experience within the Safeguarding Team. A multi-disciplinary team brings a range of professional perspectives. In any future recruitment the auditors suggest that the team should aim to include safeguarding expertise from a different professional background. This would add challenge and different perspectives to the safeguarding process in the Diocese.

The Safeguarding Manager undertakes some casework and most of the training, and the Safeguarding Advisers are currently concentrating on identifying cases where Codes of Conduct (Safeguarding Agreements) are in place, but have lapsed.

All members of the Safeguarding Team are highly committed to working closely as a team and are supportive of each other. For example, we were told that both Safeguarding Advisers do spend time in the office and take referrals, when they are working for the Diocese. As all three members of the team have many years' experience working within the area covered by the Diocese, they all have very good, established links with other agencies, MAPPA, Local Authority Designated Officers (LADOs) etc. They also have extensive links with other, non-statutory safeguarding groups and organisations, such as Circles of Support and the regional ecumenical safeguarding forum. This was extensively demonstrated in the casefiles that were audited.

The Safeguarding Team provide cover for each other during periods of leave or sickness. An out-of-hours/weekend cover service is provided, free, by the out-of-hours service of Hampshire County Council. This is a clear demonstration of the links that the Diocese has built with the County Council, and a recognition of the important role that the Diocese plays in safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

The Safeguarding Manager is currently line managed by the Head of Operations, although this is about to change to the Head of Human Resources. The auditors were

told that the Safeguarding Manager also receives professional supervision from an experienced, and qualified, senior social worker, who is currently working for the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (CaFCASS). However, it became clear during the audit that supervision consists of the Safeguarding Manager speaking to the CaFCASS employee (who is also a friend) on an 'as and when' basis over the telephone. This is not consistent with the guidance that came into being in January 2017 in the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors Regulations 2016 (5.1), and 2.6 Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance (October 2017), and the auditors suggest that this is an area for consideration.

The Safeguarding Advisers are line managed and supervised by the Safeguarding Manager. The team also meets and goes through its cases, planning workloads and logging progress.

The Cathedral is provided with a safeguarding service by the Diocesan Safeguarding Team, both regarding casework and training. There is a formal agreement between the Bishop and the Dean regarding this.

(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

The Safeguarding Manager to have formalised professional supervision that meets the requirements of relevant regulations.

Consideration is given, in any future recruitment to the Safeguarding Team, to employing staff with backgrounds other than the police force, with particular reference to practice guidance concerning the role of social workers.

Develop job descriptions and person specifications for the Safeguarding Adviser role.

2.3 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING PANEL

The Diocesan Safeguarding Panel has an Independent Chair, who undertakes his responsibilities on a voluntary basis. There is a job description in place for this role.

The current Chair is a former senior police officer (Assistant Chief Constable of Hampshire Constabulary) with considerable experience in safeguarding, not just within the police, but also representing the police force on several Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs).

The Bishop is keen to ensure that the Chair of the Safeguarding Panel also has ready

and easy access to him. This has yet to be put into practice as the Safeguarding Panel, in its current form, has only recently had its second meeting. The auditors feel, that for consistency, as with the Safeguarding Manager, it would be helpful if regular meetings were diarised.

The current form of the Safeguarding Panel is relatively new, and had only met on two occasions at the time that the audit took place. There are two sub-groups to the Safeguarding Panel: The Safeguarding Training Group and the Casework Panel. Both sub-groups continued to meet during the period between the standing down of the previous Safeguarding Panel (2015) and the formation of the current one (May 2017). The overarching panel and both sub-groups have Terms of Reference.

The Safeguarding Panel meets three times per year, the Training Sub-group twice per year and the Case work Panel four times per year.

There is very good senior representation from statutory partner agencies on the Safeguarding Panel, such as representatives from Children's Services, Adult Social Care and the Police.

The Safeguarding Panel has already developed a strategic plan for safeguarding, that it will update on an annual basis, and which will also be presented to Bishop's Council.

The new Chair is clear that it is the role of the Safeguarding Panel to hold the Diocese to account for its safeguarding service. The Bishop of Winchester also said that he welcomes a panel that will do just this. While the Chief Executive feeds back to the Bishop after each panel meeting, there is no formal process in place for the Chair of the Panel to feedback to the Bishop about the work the Panel is undertaking, or any concerns/issues that it may have about safeguarding in the Diocese. As a result, the auditors felt that the Bishop and the Chair should consider arranging regular meetings between the two of them, so that the Bishop can hear the independent challenge of the Chair at first hand.

During the audit, the auditors had several discussions about the Casework Panel and its role. In practice it has a dual purpose of dealing with complaints made by individuals about their Codes of Conduct, alongside giving advice about case closure. The auditors felt that this group could, potentially, undertake an effective quality assurance role, rather than the case management advice it currently gives regarding closure of cases. This is outlined in 2.4 of Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance (October 2017).

(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 and the Chair to consider meeting on a regular basis to feedback activity within the Safeguarding Panel.

Consider reviewing the role of the Casework Panel, in line with section 2.4 Keys Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance (October 2017), and then update the Terms of Reference for the Casework panel).

2.4 GUIDANCE, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The Diocese adheres to almost all guidance, policies and procedures that are published by the National Safeguarding Team. Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 outline areas of current guidance to which the Diocese needs to give further consideration.

The Diocese has adapted most safeguarding procedures for local use, and there are links to all the relevant documents on the diocesan website. Members of the Focus Group who were Parish Safeguarding Officers (PSOs) said that they regularly accessed and used these.

There is a guide for PSOs, published in 2016, that outlines the role and responsibilities of the PSOs

The Diocesan Synod has formally adopted the House of Bishops' safeguarding policies and procedures.

(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.)

2.5 CASEWORK

The auditors reviewed 16 case files: eight of them related to children's safeguarding and eight related to adult safeguarding.

Case records are kept using an electronic system (PAMIS). The auditors felt that this system looked relatively easy to use and navigate, and appeared to contain relevant sections required for the recording of safeguarding cases. However, in practice, recording by the Safeguarding Team consists of email exchanges. This is not in line with Safeguarding Records: Joint Practice Guidance for the Church of England and the Methodist Church (2015), and the auditors felt that safeguarding recording needs to take place in line with this, alongside making fuller use of the undoubted potential of the PAMIS system.

The case files showed that referrals were responded to in a timely manner, and the Safeguarding Team liaised very closely with all relevant statutory agencies and attended all relevant meetings convened by such agencies. Information was shared with (although there is further comment about this under 2.13), and referrals made to, the LADO.

Members of the Focus Group also spoke of a very good responsiveness from the Safeguarding Team, and of receiving a very high level of support if there were safeguarding issues that needed dealing with. They also made these comments regarding the last Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser (DSA) who was in post.

The Safeguarding Team has been undertaking Risk Assessments in line with relevant guidance (Section 5 of Practice Guidance: Responding to, Assessing and Managing Safeguarding Concerns or Allegations Against Church Officers – which includes 'Risk assessment and management of those that may pose a known risk to children, young people or vulnerable adults within a Christian congregation or community', originally published in 2015). While the auditors were aware that Risk Assessments were being

done, and that the Safeguarding Team has extensive risk assessment experience, pressure of time meant they were not consistently recorded in line with practice guidance. New risk assessment guidelines were introduced a week prior to the audit; the Diocese at the time was awaiting final templates from the National Safeguarding Team (NST), and is committed to using the new templates as soon as they are available. This needs to be addressed as the Code of Conduct (Safeguarding Agreement) should be based on the Risk Assessment, i.e. the Risk Assessment identifies the risks presented and the Code of Conduct outlines how the risks will be managed within the Church community.

The auditors reviewed several Codes of Conduct, which were all signed by the relevant people, including the member of the Safeguarding Team who was involved. Some, the auditors felt, could be more restrictive; for example specifying services that could be attended where there was less likelihood of children being present if the individual concerned presented a risk to minors. The auditors also felt that the offence or areas of concern should be specified, simply to highlight the reason why such an agreement was being put into place, or was still in place.

The auditors felt that the use of the name Code of Conduct did not refer sufficiently to the fact that there were safeguarding concerns, so would suggest that a phrase such as Safeguarding Agreement be adopted (Section 6 Practice Guidance: Responding to, Assessing and Managing Safeguarding Concerns or Allegations Against Church Officers).

The auditors did not explore any cases that required a core group. This was discussed with the Safeguarding Manager, who said that during the period she had been in post, no allegations had been made that had required a core group. In drafting the report, the auditors have come to understand that core groups have taken place that relate to cases that pre-date the employment of the current Safeguarding Manager, and that there has also been one that relates to a Church officer (rather than a member of the clergy) since she has been in post. The overall outcome of this is that the auditors are unable to comment on the use and quality of core groups within the Diocese.

Considerations for the Diocese

Undertake recording in line with Safeguarding Records: Joint Practice Guidance for the Church of England and the Methodist Church (2015), and explore ways to maximise the full potential of the PAMIS electronic recording system.

Undertake Risk Assessments on all cases that require them, in line with practice guidance.

Consider renaming Codes of Conduct in order to include the word 'Safeguarding', and making them more directive (including specifying the areas of risk presented by the individual of concern).

2.6 TRAINING

Safeguarding training is delivered by the Safeguarding Manager, with some input by a sessional trainer. The safeguarding training delivered is in line with that developed by the NST.

There is a plan to cascade training to parish level by using independent trainers. Currently, most training continues to be delivered by the Safeguarding Manager with some assistance by an external sessional trainer.

Some members of the Focus Group said that had been little explanation about the recent roll-out of the modular training, and that many people had been left quite confused by it, and unsure about which modules were relevant to them. They also felt that more training should be offered at weekends, as they said that many parish officers also have full-time jobs.

However, positive feedback was given by the Focus Group on the quality and content of the training delivered.

Historically, the numbers of people due to receive safeguarding training who had not done so were quite large. This figure has now been significantly reduced, with a very small number of incumbents who need their training to be updated. The Bishop will not renew PTO unless the individual concerned has attended recent safeguarding training.

A record of who has had training is kept by the administrator. An administrator dedicated to the organising of training is soon to be recruited.

Training is monitored via a sub-group of the Safeguarding Panel, and there is a Terms of Reference for this group.

With the recent introduction of the new training programme, the auditors felt that some extra capacity was required to assist the Safeguarding Manager to deliver what she needs to. There is some input already by a sessional trainer, and this could either be increased, or further sessional capacity brought in.

(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 further training capacity for the delivery of the training programme.

Consider greater flexibility for the delivery of training, e.g. more weekend training events.

Continue to develop communication with the parishes to explain the new learning and development framework, and who needs to do which modules.

2.7 SAFE RECRUITMENT OF CLERGY, LAY OFFICERS AND VOLUNTEERS

Six clergy Blue Files were audited. The Diocese made available a number of HR files for Diocesan Board of Finance employees who undertake regulated activities, but time did not permit the auditors' review of them.

The Blue Files were in reasonable order, with most relevant Safer Recruitment documentation in place. Not all had evidence of a current DBS in place and there was an absence of notification of attendance at safeguarding training. Evidence of DBS and safeguarding training is, however, kept on separate databases by the Diocese. Where there were safeguarding concerns, this was linked to the safeguarding file, but not necessarily in the most easily identifiable way.

Any further review of Blue File practices could sensibly wait for updated national guidelines, and advice on the application of new General Data Protection Regulations.

(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.)

2.8 DISCLOSURE AND BARRING SERVICE (DBS)

The Diocese is in the process of rolling out a new online system for DBS. There was a small trial to ensure that the new system was effective and could deliver, and the trial was successful, hence the current roll-out.

Some members of the Focus Group reported already using the online system and found it very efficient.

In 2016, a total of 1,990 DBS checks were undertaken. Two of these came back with a concern. A Risk Assessment was undertaken by the Safeguarding Team on those where there were concerns.

2.9 COMPLAINTS AND WHISTLEBLOWING

There are two complaints procedures in place, covering people who wish to complain either about the clergy, or about a non-clergy diocesan employee. Neither mention safeguarding, and while there is no expectation that dioceses have specific safeguarding complaints procedures, it may strengthen these policies if they are explicit that they can be used if people are dissatisfied with a safeguarding response from the Diocese. The policies do not appear to be on the diocesan website

There is a whistleblowing policy. Again, it does not explicitly mention safeguarding, and for the same reasons as above, it may be enhanced were it to do so.

(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

Update the complaints procedure to clarify that it can be used to make complaints about safeguarding.

Develop a whistleblowing policy that includes a section relating to safeguarding.

Consider how best to make these policies accessible to the parishes.

2.10 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

The Safeguarding Manager is the line manager and supervisor for the Safeguarding Advisers, ensuring that this is a quality assurance process for their work. A consideration has been made under 2.2 regarding the supervision of the Safeguarding Manager.

The function of the Casework Panel is discussed under 2.3, and a consideration made regarding this, and how this Panel has potential to become an effective quality assurance process.

2.11 HOW DIOCESE PROVIDES SUPPORT & MONITORING OF SAFEGUARDING IN PARISHES

Articles of Enquiry are no longer undertaken in the Diocese of Winchester, therefore safeguarding is not part of this process.

However, an annual parish audit has just been undertaken. Data from this is still in the process of being collected and collated. This information will be very useful to get a sense of what the progress is in the parishes regarding safeguarding.

This is the first time that such an audit has been undertaken, and, whilst the response rate of approximately 70 per cent is good for a new and voluntary initiative, ways need to be considered regarding getting a 100 per cent response rate.

The diocesan website carries a safeguarding page with links to key policies and procedures, and contact details of who to contact in office hours and out of hours to raise a concern/make a referral.

The Focus Group wanted more ongoing support to Parish Safeguarding Officers (PSOs) and liked the idea of deanery-level meetings and newsletters. There are many ways of keeping PSOs informed and feeling valued and it might be worth exploring this with a further Focus Group.

The auditors were told of one case where the Clergy Disciplinary Measure (CDM) was used where there had been a safeguarding issue. We felt this demonstrated that the CDM is used when there is a safeguarding matter that cannot otherwise be resolved.

Considerations for the Diocese

See 2.1 for considerations in relation to the parish self-audit.

Consider further ways to communicate with PSOs by holding a focus group etc. to get a sense of what they would find most supportive.

2.12 RESOURCES FOR CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS

There is no Authorised Listener service in the Diocese, but, instead, a counselling service is bought in from an organisation called the Portsmouth Abuse and Rape Counselling Service (PARCS).

This service will see people aged over 11 in their local area, and the Diocese will pay the costs for any required room hire, travel etc. PARCS will also see people within two weeks of referral.

Referrals into this service are made via the Safeguarding Manager.

The auditors are not aware of how useful survivors found this service, or the level of take-up, as this information is not collected by the Diocese.

Considerations for the Diocese

The Diocese to assure itself that awareness of the PARCS service is adequate to ensure that it can be requested by survivors as appropriate.

2.13 INFORMATION SHARING

Case files demonstrated that there is good information sharing between the Diocese and all external safeguarding agencies.

The Safeguarding Manager has secure access to the Hampshire and Dorset Constabulary's Records Management System (RMS). This is something that both the Diocese and the Safeguarding Panel Chair feel is crucial for partnership working and information exchange, and would like to see such access rolled out across all dioceses. The auditors were impressed by this initiative at cross-agency partnership working, and the commitment to information exchange. The initiative was led by the Hampshire and Dorset Constabulary, and it can therefore be assumed that the sharing of sometimes quite detailed information, for example in witness statements – which the auditors queried – has been approved by the police as compliant with data protection law. The Diocese shares the police view that access to this information is necessary to get a full picture of a safeguarding case.

The auditors felt that sufficient information sharing takes place via the LADO and MAPPA processes (for example), which the Safeguarding Team has good links with across the diocesan area.

The auditors are aware that in May 2018 a new Data Protection Act will come into

force, and guidance for this is already in the process of being published. In view of this it may be timely for all the organisations involved in this information sharing to satisfy themselves that it is legal under the New General Data Protection Regulations.

2.14 LINKS WITH NATIONAL SAFEGUARDING TEAM

The Safeguarding Manager is a member of the regional Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers group, which is ecumenical and has members working in safeguarding roles across the faiths.

Feedback is always made to the National Safeguarding Team when new guidance and procedures are distributed for consultation.

All those spoken to were fully aware of the direction being taken by the national team and were supportive of it, although several people, and members of the Focus Group did feel that guidance and information coming from the team was, at times, overwhelming.

3 Conclusion

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

3.1 WHAT IS WORKING WELL?

Leadership by Bishop seems to be strong – evidence from the Parish Focus Group, case files, and conversations all testifies to this.

The Safeguarding Manager is well-qualified and highly regarded. The new system of consultant Safeguarding Advisers seems to be working well and to provide good casework capacity. The Focus Group gave very positive feedback about the Safeguarding Team's accessibility and responsiveness. Casework moves along at a good pace, and no delays were seen in taking referrals forward.

The Safeguarding Panel has made a good start. The first Strategic Safeguarding Plan has realistic and achievable priorities and objectives. The Panel has strong external representation from a senior level in partner agencies.

There is a whole-diocese approach to safeguarding and the Safeguarding Team does not operate in a silo. The Chief Executive and Head of Operations are knowledgeable and supportive, and safeguarding is adequately resourced.

A lot of work has been put in with in engaging with statutory agencies and, in terms of Hampshire County Council, it is paying off in willingness to support the diocesan safeguarding agenda.

The review by Hampshire County Council and subsequent implementation report, approved by Bishop's Council, has ensured that the Safeguarding Team is able to meet current safeguarding requirements.

The parish self-audit represents a strong first attempt with a return rate of about 70 per cent. The format is comprehensive and will help parishes re-evaluate their progress next year and in years to come. Potentially, it is a source of information about areas of strength and difficulty.

The auditors saw evidence of Clergy Disciplinary Measure (CDM) being used with safeguarding as a component and felt confident that the archdeacons are willing to use this process if they need to.

The Focus Group said that training is valued and well received, and feedback is usually positive.

3.2 AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

The auditors were concerned about the training burden on the Safeguarding Manager. Perhaps at least some sessional support could be considered.

Members of the Focus Group said that the new modular training package had not been fully explained and was causing some confusion.

Casework needs to be consistently informed by changes in national policy – Risk Assessment procedures are very specific requirements of safeguarding from the National Safeguarding Team and need to be fully implemented whenever relevant.

Some of the Codes of Conduct could be more restrictive regarding e.g. which services can be attended. The auditors thought they might link in more obviously with the Risk Assessment and it may be useful to refer to the offence(s) or concerns so that people do not lose focus on why the agreement is in place. The Diocese might want to consider whether the term Code of Conduct should be changed to a phrase that includes the word 'safeguarding', e.g. Safeguarding Agreement.

The recording of casework needs development. At present it is too difficult to work out who's who, and minutes of important meetings become lost among the email trails. The auditors are aware that the Diocese is developing PAMIS but consideration should be given to whether case histories can be grasped quickly from the records on PAMIS and whether it is used to its full capacity.

The Focus Group wanted more ongoing support to PSOs and liked the idea of deanery-level meetings and newsletters. There are many ways of keeping PSOs informed and feeling valued and it might be worth exploring this with another Focus Group.

Complaints procedures do not come up in a search on the diocesan website, and the procedures makes no mention of safeguarding. The whistleblowing procedure also does not explicitly cover safeguarding.

Recently, the Casework Review Panel has acted as an appeal panel for complaints about safeguarding agreements. The Terms of Reference give it a wider range of responsibilities. The Diocese may wish to reconsider the functions of this panel since the publication of Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance (October 2017).

APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS

DATA COLLECTION

Information provided to auditors

- Last two years' annual statistical return
- Winchester diocesan structure and profile
- Details of counselling service
- Safeguarding Training Programme and data
- Diocese of Winchester Safeguarding Review 2015
- Two case reviews
- Diocesan Safeguarding Strategy
- Last two sets of minutes for the Safeguarding Panel
- Casework Group update May 2015
- Complaints Procedure
- Sample training modules
- Job descriptions for the Safeguarding Manager and Chair of the Safeguarding Panel
- Localised policies and procedures

Participation of members of the Diocese

The auditors had conversations with:

- The Bishop (telephone conversation with lead auditor)
- The Chief Executive/Bishop's delegated lead for safeguarding
- The Diocesan Secretary
- Head of HR
- The Chair and one member of the Safeguarding Panel
- The Safeguarding Manager
- One Safeguarding Adviser (telephone conversation)
- An Archdeacon
- The Bishop's Chaplain

The audit: what records / files were examined?

- Sixteen case files were audited, eight of them related to children's safeguarding, and eight related to adult safeguarding. Six clergy Blue Files were audited.

LIMITATIONS OF AUDIT

There were no limitations to the audit.