

A REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
SAFEGUARDING TRAINING AND
DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Eleanor Stobart
November 2018

Eleanor Stobart (the project lead) and the National Safeguarding Team would like to thank everyone who contributed to this review – particularly those who helped to organise the diocesan visits at such short notice.

There are too many survivors, staff, volunteers and clergy to name, but thank you for giving your time and thoughts freely. We appreciate the openness and honesty with which you all discussed your experience of safeguarding, the safeguarding training and the impact that you feel it is having on the national Church.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	5
2	TERMS OF REFERENCE	6
2.1	Reference group.....	6
2.2	Scope of the review.....	6
3	METHODOLOGY	7
3.1	Questionnaires	7
3.2	Diocesan and cathedral visits.....	7
3.3	Independent chairs and diocesan safeguarding advisors.....	9
3.4	Additional meetings and telephone calls.....	10
4	FINDINGS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES	10
4.1	Dioceses.....	10
4.2	Cathedrals	14
4.3	Theological education institutions	16
4.4	Religious communities	18
5	EMERGING THEMES FROM QUESTIONNAIRES AND DIOCESAN VISITS.....	20
5.1	The Framework could be interpreted and implemented more consistently	20
5.2	Each diocesan safeguarding team is different	20
5.3	Face-to-face safeguarding training is preferred	23
5.4	The training could be more accessible.....	24
5.5	Greater clarity is needed around who requires what training	25
5.6	The focus is on core training	25
5.7	Training modules have been adapted and combined	26
5.8	Training equips church officers to perform their safeguarding responsibilities	26
5.9	There is some resistance to attending safeguarding training.....	27
5.10	Requests for advice and support have increased	28

5.11	The response to victims and survivors	28
5.12	The impact of a significant safeguarding issue in the past.....	29
5.13	The importance of support and commitment from clergy	29
5.14	Theological education institutions are key.....	30
5.15	The importance of support from the National Safeguarding Team.....	31
6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	32
7	RECOMMENDATIONS	33
8	APPENDIX: Core modules of safeguarding training	35

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Since March 2013 government guidance¹ has explicitly stated that like other organisations and agencies who work with children and adults, faith organisations should have appropriate arrangements in place to safeguard and protect them from harm. In 2013, there was a very varied picture of safeguarding training across the Church of England, with some church bodies offering safeguarding training and others not. A thorough review of safeguarding training was therefore undertaken which aimed to learn not only from existing good practice within the national Church, but also learn from the experience of statutory partners and those with whom the national Church works ecumenically. The 2013 review revealed that safeguarding learning was inconsistent in quality and provision within dioceses and places of learning. The General Synod and House of Bishops recognised that a stronger national role was required to lead on safeguarding, as it was clear that a healthy Christian community is one which ensures and nurtures the wellbeing of all

Between 2013 and 2015, the National Safeguarding Team worked with a number of dioceses to develop pilot training materials which were then rolled out (subject to testing and feedback). This Safeguarding Training and Development Framework was designed to ensure consistent training and development of safeguarding practice across the national Church. It aims to develop and maintain the necessary knowledge, attitude and skills to safeguard and protect children, young people and vulnerable adults, by ensuring that all church officers² are trained in safeguarding relevant to their role. The framework sets out:

- Details of the range of core training modules (see page 35), including learning aims and objectives, and expectations and requirements to undertake training by role
- Details of the range of specialist training modules, including learning aims and objectives, and expectations and requirements to undertake training by role
- Proposals for implementation of the framework.

The Framework³ was published and formally introduced across the national Church in January 2016. The purpose of this review was to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the Training and Development Framework on safeguarding across the national Church (England).

¹ See for example s.58 Working Together to Safeguard Children HM Government July 2018 and the Care Act 2014

² A "church officer" is anyone appointed/elected by, or on behalf of the Church to a post or role, whether they are ordained or lay, paid or unpaid

³ To view the Church of England Safeguarding Training and Development Framework see <https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/SafeguardingTrainingAndDevelopmentWeb.pdf> - accessed online 8 October 2018

2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

To evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework an independent consultant was commissioned as the lead project manager.

2.1 Reference group

To support the lead project manager a reference group was established. The role of the reference group included:

- Contributing to and agreeing the scope of the review and the terms of reference
- Providing expertise, background information and knowledge concerning Church structures and processes
- Providing a diocesan perspective regarding the training
- Identifying the types of qualitative and quantitative data that may be available
- Identifying other individuals who may be well placed to support the review.

The membership of the group included diocesan safeguarding advisors (DSA), safeguarding trainers, representatives from the National Safeguarding Team and selected roles in ministry and mission. The reference group met three times during the course of the review (May – October 2018).

2.2 Scope of the review

To undertake the review, a number of issues required exploration. These comprised (amongst other things):

- Has safeguarding training equipped church officers to confidently develop and maintain safe practice (relevant to their role) with children and adults, particularly those at risk of harm or abuse?
- Has the focus on safeguarding led to (for example):
 - An increase in the number of referrals to statutory agencies?
 - Improved appropriate discussions with diocesan safeguarding advisors?
 - Enhanced working relationships with other professionals such as the local authority designated officer, police, social care and health?
 - Improved inter-diocesan relationships and cooperation?
 - Better support being offered to victims, survivors and ex-offenders?
 - A decrease in the time taken to identify and raise concerns?
- Do church officers have a full understanding of their safeguarding duties and responsibilities as set out in the practice guidance?

- Does the approach used to implement the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework require any change or revision to ensure it is "fit for purpose"?
- What progress have individual dioceses, cathedrals, religious communities and theological education institutions made in implementing the training?

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Questionnaires

To understand the progress that individual dioceses, cathedrals⁴, religious communities and theological education institutions had made in implementing the training, each one was sent a questionnaire. In all 146 questionnaires were sent and 122 were returned (84%).

	SENT	RETURNED	NO RESPONSE
Dioceses	42	41	1
Cathedrals	43	39	4
Religious communities	37	21	16
Theological education institutions	24	21	3
TOTAL	146	122	24

The questionnaire included a number of quantitative questions as well as seeking some qualitative information. For example, respondents were asked about the number of trainers (paid and voluntary) that were in their service, how many church officers have attended training and how many still require training. There were questions about the safeguarding arrangements between dioceses, cathedrals, religious communities and theological education institutions. Respondents were also asked to outline the barriers they faced in implementing the Framework as well as setting out what was working well. Respondents were asked about the impact of safeguarding training and whether training modules had been adapted or combined.

3.2 Diocesan and cathedral visits

To examine some of the 'issues for exploration' in greater detail, the lead project manager identified ten dioceses in which to hold individual meetings and focus groups. The ten areas

⁴ The term "cathedral" is used throughout this report to include all cathedrals, cathedrals that are also parish churches, abbeys, minsters and royal peculiars

were diverse in a number of ways e.g. urban, rural, population size, geographically and culturally. The identified dioceses were:

- | | | | |
|------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| i. | Bath and Wells | ii. | Norwich |
| iii. | Birmingham | iv. | Portsmouth |
| v. | Hereford | vi. | Southwark |
| vii. | Liverpool | viii. | Southwell and Nottingham |
| ix. | Newcastle upon Tyne | x. | York |

The diocesan safeguarding advisor⁵ for each of the ten dioceses was asked to arrange a programme of meetings with a wide range of individuals from both the diocese and the local cathedral. Suggested individuals and group meetings included:

- Diocesan safeguarding adviser
- Safeguarding trainers (voluntary and paid)
- Survivors/victims
- Diocesan bishop
- Independent chair of the diocesan safeguarding advisory panel⁶
- Group of incumbents
- Group of parish safeguarding officers (PSO)
- Mixed group of church officers who had attended core safeguarding training
- Local authority designated officer⁷
- Cathedral dean
- Cathedral safeguarding lead
- Mixed group of cathedral officers who had attended core safeguarding training

The purpose of the meetings was to gather qualitative data that would complement and reinforce the information gathered from the questionnaires. The meetings also provided an opportunity to gain further information about other aspects of the safeguarding training e.g. preferences in mode of delivery, understanding of policy and the confidence of individuals

⁵ Each diocese has a diocesan safeguarding advisor to support the diocese in the development of its safeguarding arrangements. See https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2017-10/dsa-regulations-as-amended-2017_0.pdf for further information. The role of the diocesan safeguarding advisor is diverse and they should:

- Ensure that allegations of abuse are appropriately referred to the statutory authorities
- Provide appropriate advice and support to survivors and victims of abuse
- Ensure that those who pose a risk are appropriately supported and managed
- Advise the diocese on all safeguarding matters

⁶ Each diocese has an independent chair who oversees the diocesan safeguarding advisory panel. The purpose of the panel is to provide independent scrutiny of safeguarding practice and policy within the diocese.

⁷ The local authority designated officer (LADO) coordinates all allegations and concerns made against adults who work with children

to use the knowledge that they had gained. Questions were also asked about (amongst other things) commitment to safeguarding, cultural change and whether there were any specific barriers to implementing the Framework. Inevitably, those attending the meetings were self-selecting and therefore their attitude towards safeguarding and training may have been more positive than those who chose not to be involved in the review.

Only one diocese declined to take part in the visits. The diocese stated that too many key individuals were unavailable, but they would be prepared to host a visit later in the year. By that time, however, the review would have been completed. The National Safeguarding Team did not feel able to insist that the diocese take part. All the other dioceses worked hard to arrange programmes that included many of the suggested individuals and groups. Therefore, between July and September 2018, the project lead visited a total of nine dioceses (21%) out of the total national number of 42 dioceses. The diocesan visits provided a wealth of information, much of which is included throughout the report.

3.3 Independent chairs and diocesan safeguarding advisors

During the period of the review, the independent chairs of diocesan safeguarding advisory panels had a networking day. The day was attended by 21 chairs, and the lead project manager used the opportunity to garner their thoughts about safeguarding and the implementation of the Framework. The questions asked were:

- i. Is there an open channel of communication between the diocesan safeguarding advisory board and the bishop?
- ii. What were the three things that most surprised you on taking up your position?
- iii. What were the three things you felt needed challenging when you took up post?
- iv. How would you describe the safeguarding culture in your diocese?
- v. Do you have a view of the progress of the current safeguarding training in your diocese?
- vi. How do you scrutinise the progress that has been made on the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework?
- vii. How often is training and development an agenda item at the diocesan safeguarding board meetings?
- viii. Is there anything you feel you need from the National Safeguarding Team to fulfil your role in scrutinising the implementation of the Framework locally?

A similar event took place for diocesan safeguarding advisors and safeguarding trainers. Again, the opportunity was taken to speak to the diocesan safeguarding advisors (38), assistant diocesan safeguarding advisors (13) and trainers (8) who attended, and gather their thoughts. The questions asked were:

- i. In your opinion what are your three top priorities?
- ii. What are your top three concerns?

- iii. How would you describe your links with the National Safeguarding Team?
- iv. Approximately, what percentage of your time is taken up with safeguarding training?
- v. Describe your relationship with the independent chair of the diocesan safeguarding board
- vi. What are your greatest achievements around implementing the Framework?
- vii. Describe an incident when safeguarding training made a real impact

3.4 Additional meetings and telephone calls

As some individuals were not available during the diocesan visits, separate meetings or telephone conversations were held with a number of bishops (4), deans (1), archdeacons (1), victims/survivors (1) and local authority designated officers (2).

Information from the questionnaires, diocesan and cathedrals visits, the workshops, additional meetings and telephone conversations is included throughout the report.

4 FINDINGS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES

4.1 Dioceses

Questionnaires were sent to 42 dioceses and only one diocese did not respond. Of those returned one was of such poor quality that it could not be used. Therefore, 40 (95%) questionnaires were available to evaluate. Dioceses vary in size geographically, by population and in their number of parishes. Some are urban and some rural. All these features impact on how the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework is implemented as well as how many people require training. Unsurprisingly, each diocese has interpreted and implemented the training differently.

The training programme is delivered both at evenings and weekends to ensure it is accessible to the volunteer workforce and in locations across the diocese, which is 2,661 square miles in size and therefore travelling to venues add additional commitments in terms of working hours upon the diocesan safeguarding advisor and the assistant diocesan safeguarding advisor.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

There are various models for delivering safeguarding training across dioceses. The majority of dioceses have a paid trainer, although it is frequently a part-time position. The trainer is often supported by a team of volunteer trainers. The size of the team of volunteer trainers varies from as few as two, to teams of up to 60. Only two dioceses had a diocesan safeguarding advisor who undertook all the case work as well as the training role singlehandedly. Some dioceses only used paid trainers to deliver the training (4 dioceses), in other areas the diocesan safeguarding advisor (and/or their assistant) delivered all the training backed up by a team of volunteers (5 dioceses) whilst two dioceses appeared to use

volunteers to deliver all their training. A few areas used external trainers on a sessional basis – these were usually individuals, but occasionally dioceses commissioned the services of organisations such as "thirtyone:eight"⁸ or a specialist organisation (e.g. Women's Aid) to provide specific training such as responding to domestic abuse (S3).

Some dioceses concentrate on training all paid staff, focussing particularly on clergy, whereas others are attempting to provide basic safeguarding awareness training (C0) to as many church officers as possible. It is clear from the responses to the questionnaires that implementing the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework is a huge undertaking. Many dioceses have trained hundreds, if not thousands of individuals in core modules, but still need to train thousands more.

The figures in the tables below show estimations from three dioceses on the numbers of church officers who require training and at what level. Church guidance suggests that approximately 30 people should be trained at each session. This equates to approximately 350 training sessions per 10,000 individuals. Church officers are required to update their safeguarding training every three years.

Example of a diocese with 2 part-time paid trainers and 5 volunteer trainers		
CORE MODULES	Numbers trained	Number still requiring training
C0 Awareness	875	9000
C1 Foundation	240	5700
C2 Leadership	45	3000
C3 Foundation/leadership for ministers	520	500
C4 Bishops/Deans, Principals and senior staff	21	0
SPECIALIST MODULES		
S1 Safer Recruitment	560	1000
S2 Pastoral care, confidentiality and confession	Not yet available	2000
S3 Responding to domestic abuse	24	2000
S4 Grooming, sexual abuse, responding to survivors	Not yet available	2000
S5 Assessing and managing risk	Not yet available	2000
S6 Spiritual abuse	Not yet available	2000
S7 Support person/link person	Not yet available	30
Total	2,285	29,230

⁸ Thirtyone:eight (formerly known as the Churches' Child Protection Advisory Service or CCPAS) is an independent Christian charity providing professional advice, training, support and resources in all areas of safeguarding children and adults at risk of harm – for further information see <https://www.ccpas.co.uk> – accessed online 2 October 2018

Example of a diocese with 1 full-time paid trainer and 25 volunteer trainers – this diocese was involved in piloting the training

CORE MODULES	Numbers trained	Number still requiring training
C0 Awareness	2000	
C1 Foundation	2000	5000 over next 3 years
C2 Leadership	500	2000 over next 3 years
C3 Foundation/leadership for ministers	100	550 over next 3 years
C4 Bishops/Deans, Principals and senior staff	30	5
SPECIALIST MODULES		
S1 Safer Recruitment	10	1000
S2 Pastoral care, confidentiality and confession	Not yet available	1000
S3 Responding to domestic abuse	0	1000
S4 Grooming, sexual abuse, responding to survivors	Not yet available	1000
S5 Assessing and managing risk	Not yet available	1000
S6 Spiritual abuse	Not yet available	1000
S7 Support person/link person	Not yet available	10
Total	4,640	13,565

Example of a diocese with 1 part-time paid trainer and 6 volunteer trainers

CORE MODULES	Numbers trained	Number still requiring training
C0 Awareness	2000	5000
C1 Foundation	1600	3500
C2 Leadership	68	3000
C3 Foundation/leadership for ministers	400	8
C4 Bishops/Deans, Principals and senior staff	25	2
SPECIALIST MODULES		
S1 Safer Recruitment	360	33
S2 Pastoral care, confidentiality and confession	Not yet available	
S3 Responding to domestic abuse	0	4000
S4 Grooming, sexual abuse, responding to survivors	Not yet available	4000
S5 Assessing and managing risk	Not yet available	800
S6 Spiritual abuse	Not yet available	4000
S7 Support person/link person	Not yet available	50
Total	4,453	24,393

At least half of the dioceses were unable to forecast how many church officers would require training in the future. The reason for this is threefold. First, information about volunteers is held at parish level; second, systems do not exist to monitor this information and third, volunteers come and go depending on their personal circumstances and are not required to inform the diocese. Some dioceses try to forecast by estimating that each parish will need to train approximately ten people (although some may need to attend several different modules of the training). Dioceses vary in their number of parishes from 140 to 611.

Most dioceses are providing training for theological education institutions and religious communities within their local areas. For some the numbers are limited, whereas for others the additional numbers appear burdensome. For example, one diocese has four theological education institutions and nine religious communities in its area in addition to the cathedral. This diocese provides training for all these church bodies.

There were a lot of positive comments from diocesan questionnaires about their achievements including:

- *We have seen a 20% increase in referrals to the diocesan safeguarding team in the last year and an 80% increase in requests for information and advice in the first quarter of 2018, which reflects greater awareness*
- *There appears to be increased awareness of safeguarding responsibilities. More parishes are requesting training and seeking advice regarding embedding good safeguarding practice. When travelling around parishes there is clear evidence of good safeguarding practice e.g. safeguarding notice board in church, information on parish website and specialist services advertised in church (e.g. domestic abuse support).*

ONE DIOCESE'S EXPERIENCE

This diocese has been training people in safeguarding for many years but now is able to really get to grips with it by employing a full-time training coordinator. The church as a whole is on a massive culture change regarding who is involved and why they need to be trained and this has proved to be difficult in a small number of areas within the diocese because sometimes people don't like change. On the whole, however, people have embraced the need for more robust training for a wider audience and they are very much on board. One of the main comments of objection is down to lack of education, such as "*we don't need safeguarding training because we do not have any children*". The message has now got through that safeguarding is not only about children. On the whole there have been very few, if at all any barriers for people who want to attend a course. We have put a lot of work into making sure that we listen to what would make it easier for people to attend. We have 18 deaneries and two main towns and people found it restrictive to have to always travel to the main towns so now we deliver localised training within each deanery by locally trained trainers.

Diocesan Safeguarding Trainer and Training Coordinator

Equally there remain barriers for many dioceses trying to implement safeguarding training including:

- *The change of culture is not quite where we want it to be. Some individuals are reluctant to attend due to having completed safeguarding training in other jobs or for other organisations. A few people still do not see it as relevant*
- *It is difficult to get a full picture of how many volunteers are working in the parishes to ascertain how many need training in the core foundation module (C1). We have increased numbers at these sessions to 30 where the venue allows this, but we do have a level of non-attendance which is frustrating when we have waiting lists for courses*
- *The volume of the training required is an enormous challenge because of the size of the diocese. The number of people attending our courses (face-to-face) has increased by 250% since the same period a year ago, as we have particularly focussed on extending the availability of parish-based foundation (C1) courses. However, we do not hold centrally lists of individuals in all groups who require training and current systems for recording attendance do not adequately support us understanding the exact scale of need.*

4.2 Cathedrals

Questionnaires were sent to all 43 cathedrals and 39 (91%) responded. It is clear that many cathedrals have large numbers of staff and volunteers. Volunteer numbers frequently range from 150 to over 600 depending on the size and location of the cathedral. In addition, some have up to 250 members of staff. Clearly, these are large numbers of church officers who require safeguarding training both in core modules and specialist modules.

The majority of cathedrals rely on the local diocesan safeguarding team to provide training. Out of the 39 responses, 11 cathedrals stated that they have a service level agreement, memorandum of understanding or written agreement with their local diocese to provide safeguarding training and advice. Indeed, six cathedrals stated that they could not provide any figures for the number of church officers who had been trained, as all these records are all kept by the local diocese.

Before I started there was no relationship with the diocese, but now we are fully integrated. There is an agreement in that there is a letter between the bishop and the dean. The relationship by its nature is fairly reactive, they will always give advice and come and do bits of training, but until now there hasn't been a proactive safeguarding person for the cathedral, so now there will be something more formal.

(Cathedral safeguarding lead)

Twelve cathedrals have their own trainers – in nine cathedrals these are part-time paid posts. Only two cathedrals have a dedicated safeguarding advisor post – although another is

considering employing a safeguarding advisor and perhaps sharing the advisor with another cathedral. Some cathedrals have volunteer safeguarding leads who have taken on that role in addition to their (non-safeguarding) post. One cathedral described using an external safeguarding training provider. The external trainer provides face-to-face core safeguarding (C1) and leadership (C2) training. This model has ensured that the majority of church officers have already attended training – *"the quality of the training has meant that its reputation has been high and so volunteers have come more willingly"*.

There is a huge disparity between different cathedrals and the number of church officers who have attended training. One cathedral stated that they have *"adopted a low-key approach reflecting the lack of significant safeguarding issues at the cathedral over the past ten years"*. This cathedral appeared not to have provided any core safeguarding training (C0, C1 or C2) to any volunteer or staff member. The only training that had taken place was that two church officers attended the senior staff training (C4). There are other cathedrals who have focussed solely on delivering training to paid staff, thus volunteers, lay clerks⁹ and others who have contact with children are yet to receive training. Equally, there are examples of cathedrals that have obviously worked hard to ensure that all volunteers have a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities concerning safeguarding. For example, a number have trained all volunteers in core safeguarding (C0 & C1) using both face-to-face courses and the online courses available [*we have trained 455 in core safeguarding (C0) – 333 face-to-face and 122 online*]. Those cathedrals tend to have either a close relationship with their diocese, use external providers or have their own trainers (paid and voluntary).

We are pretty good with our choir; the musical director is hot on safeguarding and understands his role. He is also willing to be helped.

(Cathedral safeguarding lead)

It is not uncommon for cathedrals not to know how many volunteers and staff still require training. It was not obvious from the questionnaires whether this is because the local diocese tends to hold this information, or it is simply not being collected. Whatever the case, forecasting training needs is essential in order that senior staff know what resources are likely to be required and to ensure sufficient funding is in place.

Cathedrals were asked about the impact and subsequent achievements around safeguarding training. Some considered that the focus on safeguarding has already started to raise the profile.

- *We see training as part of our investment in volunteers and an opportunity for building community and helping to promote safeguarding as a natural part of what we do rather than something to be wary of*
- *We are fortunate that our diocesan safeguarding advisor provides in-situ training, which has enabled a high attendance rate from staff. Off-site training would be more*

⁹ Cathedrals often have a team of professional adult singers known as lay clerks

problematic as we have a small staff team, which needs to be on site. On-site training also enables us to explore issues which directly relate to our own context and working patterns

- *We are pleased that safeguarding training is now part of our cathedral recruitment process for staff and volunteers. The online training has generally been a great success for us as we process so many volunteers. Because we have made core training (C0) compulsory for all staff and volunteers as an entry level, this has helped us embed a culture of safeguarding in the cathedral.*

Although there are some positive aspects to the safeguarding training, there remain some barriers. Those cathedrals who had trained the most volunteers and staff, tended to favour a combination of face-to-face and online training with a preference for face-to-face. The difficulties surrounding online safeguarding training was reflected in the comments about barriers to implementing the training. Many older church officers in cathedrals (as was found in the dioceses) actually find the online training inaccessible and prefer to attend face-to-face training in groups.

- *Core (C0) training for volunteers is not always appropriate. Many don't have online access and the content can be quite daunting and worrying to some. This is better done within C1 on a face-to-face basis so that questions can be addressed and support given in a safe environment for expression as required*
- *The raft of safeguarding training is a huge undertaking for us to ensure all staff and volunteers are trained to the correct level and in a timely manner. We do not have specific training or safeguarding resource to concentrate on this only, even as a large Cathedral. Resource is a real issue*
- *Online availability of C0 and C1 is very helpful, but the chapter safeguarding lead, the diocesan safeguarding adviser and the safeguarding trainer agree that one module should be delivered face-to-face to ensure engagement and judge processing. In our case, this is C2 and so the online availability of this module is of limited value to us.*

Clearly, cathedrals differed in their ability (and willingness) to engage with safeguarding training. Those with dedicated trainers or close working relationships with their local diocesan safeguarding advisor and safeguarding teams appeared to be more confident at understanding what is required. Others undoubtedly have only just started their journey and have a long way to go.

4.3 Theological education institutions

Responses were received from 21 of the 24 questionnaires sent to theological education institutions (87.5%). Nevertheless, three responses stated that their local diocese would send in their relevant statistics and information. A further two responses were of too poor a quality to be of use. In all, there were 16 questionnaires available for analysis (66.5%).

It was clear from the responses that training is taking place. Some theological education institutions showed a more structured approach to safeguarding training. These institutions tended to have a larger number of ordinands and they used independent organisations to provide their safeguarding training. Eleven theological education institutions responded that their local diocese provided all the safeguarding training. Most of these used the online safeguarding courses for the basic awareness and foundation modules (C0 & C1) with the diocesan safeguarding team providing the leadership modules (C2) on an annual basis. Nevertheless, only one theological education institution appeared to have a formal agreement with their diocese concerning what training the diocese would provide and when.

Two theological education institutions used independent training companies such as thirtyone:eight, the NSPCC or specific consultancy companies. A member of staff in one college attended the National Safeguarding Team's training day for theological education institutions and now he delivers all their safeguarding training. Two institutions used individual trainers and a further one used a part-time volunteer to provide training to ordinands. One response implied that the theological education institution was struggling to provide any safeguarding training either from an independent source or from the local diocese.

There were many comments within the questionnaires as to the positive effect of safeguarding training. Below are some examples:

- *Raising awareness for students prepares them for future ministry. They particularly enjoy scenarios as they may not currently have the experience to have dealt with examples raised. Safeguarding sessions gives students opportunities to think about such issues and a safe area in which to discuss them*
- *In the last two/three years we have found that more students come to us having already completed the basic awareness, foundation (C0&C1) and even leadership (C2) modules, as these are now rolled out across the dioceses and are required for those involved in church work in their parishes*
- *We have been able to move from a culture of 'requirement' to a culture of 'mission'. By introducing theological reflection into the leadership (C2) module we have noticed students embed safeguarding into their professional practice as the mission of the Church and core to their role and activity*

Theological education institutions, however, continue to experience barriers to introducing safeguarding training.

- *Have difficulty fitting it into a crowded curriculum*
- *We need regular face-to-face training and we need the diocese for that*
- *It would be very good to see a greater focus on the theology of safeguarding in training – linking theology and practice. This would enable ministerial students to locate safeguarding as a core part of their identity and call*

It was evident from the questionnaires that some theological education institutions have embraced safeguarding training and are working hard to comply with it. Others are obviously struggling to understand its relevance and how to implement the training.

4.4 Religious communities

Questionnaires were sent to 37 religious communities and 22 responded (59%). Of those, five were of insufficient quality to provide adequate information. Thus, this review considered 17 (46%) responses to questionnaires.

No religious community had its own trainer, although one sister was a deanery safeguarding trainer within her diocese. Generally, respondents indicated that their local diocese provided safeguarding training. Nevertheless, this was further complicated because some communities do not have a "mother house" therefore, members are geographically spread across the country and live in numerous different dioceses. In these cases, members are expected to undertake safeguarding training in the diocese in which they live.

Our sisters are very dispersed – 14 sisters live in seven different dioceses, not counting a sister in residential care in Wales. Sisters take part in the training provided in the dioceses where they live, and some also receive training from other organisations with whom they work. The sisters are briefed annually at a face-to-face meeting, about updates to our safeguarding policies and any changes of practice.

Some respondents implied that members may not require safeguarding training from the diocese because they had already received training from organisations in which they work (e.g. health, hospices, charities etc.). Only one stated that they had no arrangements in place because they were waiting for national guidance for religious communities. Others described how all safeguarding concerns were passed to their local diocesan safeguarding advisor. They regularly checked with the diocesan safeguarding advisor what was recommended in the way of training and safeguarding policies.

From the respondents, it was not possible to establish whether the appropriate individuals have been trained. Only one religious community stated that no member had received any training in the current safeguarding modules. A number of respondents cited age, frailty and infirmity as reasons that members of the community were not able to attend training.

Others explained that their local diocesan safeguarding advisor or trainer had come to the community and provided bespoke face-to-face training. Wider members of communities, such as gardeners, cooks, office staff, groundsmen and maintenance staff were less likely to have attended training, although some had undertaken the basic course (C0) online. It was clear that the majority of sisters, priests and monks had attended face-to-face safeguarding specifically aimed at the clergy (C3). Most of the religious communities focused on the core modules of training (C0 – C3). Nevertheless, some expressed an interest in attending further training on specialist modules including safer recruitment, pastoral care, domestic abuse and spiritual abuse (S1 – S6).

In religious communities there is also confusion about who requires training and at what level. Some religious communities have clearly worked hard to ensure all their members are trained. One described how all 24 members had been provided with relevant levels of face-to-face training (C0, C1, C2 and C3) by the diocese. A further 16 members had attended the domestic abuse training. The questionnaire itself appears to have raised the profile of safeguarding for some religious communities i.e. *"following meeting with the safeguarding officer, we are in the process of ascertaining what training is still needed in our situation"; "I am just about to contact the diocese re training for our community"*.

Some religious communities asked for specific safeguarding training to take place alongside other religious communities. They felt it could then be tailored to be more appropriate to their particular situation. One religious community stated that they had paid the diocese for training. It is unclear whether each diocese should provide training to religious communities in their area free of charge i.e. religious communities should be treated the same as parish churches. If this is the case, it does not appear to be widely understood by either the dioceses or the religious communities. The questionnaires provided some positive comments from religious communities about their experience of safeguarding training. These included:

- *We are all very much more aware of the issues and the vital importance of good practice. This now includes those who are not ordained or licensed lay ministers, and who might in some cases in the past have thought the issues need not concern them overmuch. We all tend to think of the safeguarding implications of a situation far more readily than used to be the case with some*
- *I think our safeguarding policies and training makes us much more aware of things that might have happened in the past, what is happening now in the Church and elsewhere regarding allegations and abuse and we are much more aware generally of the seriousness of effects on those who have been abused.*

Religious communities were also asked about the barriers they faced concerning safeguarding training. These included:

- *Dioceses do not routinely communicate details of their safeguarding training to religious residents in their dioceses unless they are ordained, or licensed lay ministers. Inclusion of all religious houses in a diocese on the safeguarding training circulation list would help significantly*
- *We are awaiting publication, by the Advisory Council for Relations between Bishops and Religious Communities' of a new edition of 'A Handbook of the Religious Life' which will include a new chapter on safeguarding.*

5 EMERGING THEMES FROM QUESTIONNAIRES AND DIOCESAN VISITS

5.1 The Framework could be interpreted and implemented more consistently

The Framework is neither interpreted nor implemented consistently. Understandably, dioceses, cathedrals, theological education institutions and religious communities all interpret and implement the Framework to suit their local needs. It was clear from the questionnaires and diocesan visits that diocesan safeguarding teams vary in size and they serve very different areas. Furthermore, they have differing amounts of funding and resources. Some have only recently started to implement the Framework whilst others who were part of the pilot project have been providing safeguarding training for a number of years. In order to be pragmatic and proportionate each diocese has had to adapt its approach in order to provide the extensive safeguarding training set out in the Framework.

5.2 Each diocesan safeguarding team is different

From the responses to the questionnaires and the diocesan visits, it became quite apparent that each diocesan safeguarding team is structured, managed, organised and supervised differently. Although this disparity may not be a problem in itself, it does mean that it is more difficult to reach the desired effect of consistent training and development of safeguarding practice across the national Church.

DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISORS

Each diocese has a diocesan safeguarding advisor and this is where the similarity often ends. Diocesan safeguarding advisors (the name can vary between dioceses) come from various professional backgrounds; most commonly social care, police, health and probation. Diocesan safeguarding advisors describe receiving little or no further training for their role. Thus, they are expected to come into post fully trained. This is concerning as this is a specialist role, which is not replicated in any other statutory agency. The role requires a number of specialist skills for example, the ability to train, skills to assess and manage risk, the ability to relate to, and support, victims and survivors, skills to work with offenders and understand offenders' behaviour and the ability to manage a team of staff and volunteers (this list is not exhaustive). Current guidance from the National Safeguarding Team suggests that the role should ideally be suited to those who have a professional background and experience of working in social care. This understandably has caused ill-feeling for those who come from a different professional background, yet possess many of the required skills and capabilities. Equally, the pay scales of diocesan safeguarding advisors (and trainers) varies considerably between dioceses. There are other disparities that occur around professional supervision. Ideally, diocesan safeguarding advisors who are providing case work should be professionally supervised by a suitably qualified person. Often diocesan safeguarding advisors arrange their own supervision which can lead to differences in the quality of that supervision. Some diocesan safeguarding advisors provide a formal paid "out of hours" service for safeguarding concerns raised during evenings and weekends, whilst

others provide this type of cover out of "good will". Some areas provide no out of hours service.

Although some of these issues may not appear to be related to safeguarding training, it was clear from discussions that having the appropriate specialist skills, management skills, ability to train, ability to undertake a training needs analysis and forecast training needs, equity in remuneration and the availability of professional supervision all have an impact on how successfully diocesan safeguarding advisors are able to implement the Framework. Inevitably, providing an out of hours service will have an impact on the amount of time available to provide training. Thus, there needs to be uniformity in these aspects in order to support diocesan safeguarding teams to implement the Framework consistently across the national Church.

Our training programme equates to 102 training courses being offered to over 3000 people across the diocese. In practical terms it equates to 48 days of the year where the diocesan safeguarding advisor or the assistant diocesan safeguarding advisor are focused purely on delivering training, which places a significant strain on meeting the wider demands of the safeguarding role for the diocese.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

Despite their differences in professional background, one common theme across the dioceses that were visited, was that diocesan safeguarding advisors are held in high esteem. Church officers, whether it was a bishop or a parish safeguarding officer, stated that their diocesan safeguarding advisor was available to provide advice and support, they respected their judgement and were extremely grateful for the service they provided. It is evident that they are working extremely hard, not only to implement the Framework, but also to carry out their other duties.

SAFEGUARDING TRAINERS

Again, each diocesan safeguarding team was structured differently. Therefore, some dioceses have paid trainers in full-time positions, whereas in other dioceses the diocesan safeguarding advisor undertakes training. Some used sessional trainers. In some areas training is always delivered in pairs, in others it is delivered by a sole person. Inevitably, the modules provided are different with some dioceses encouraging face-to-face training and others preferring the online versions. Volunteer trainers take on varying amounts of responsibility for providing training to parishes, with some even presenting at clergy training.

Not enough networking opportunities specifically for trainers. Trainers want to come to network days to develop training ideas.

(Safeguarding trainer)

One of the issues described by trainers is their isolated role within the team. They described wanting to participate in regional support groups for trainers. In some areas, trainers themselves have set up their own local trainer forum. Trainers particularly asked for

guidance and training from the National Safeguarding Team, so they could feel better equipped and confident to present the safeguarding training material.

PARISH SAFEGUARDING OFFICERS

Throughout discussions it became apparent that parish safeguarding officers play an essential part in rolling out training. They are key to ensuring that each parish has the appropriate systems and structures in place as well as ensuring that church officers have data and barring scheme (DBS) checks and attend the correct level of training for their role. Again, this is an isolated role in which some parish safeguarding officers face resistance and sometimes aggression. The parish safeguarding officer is a voluntary position that relies on the goodwill of those undertaking the role. During discussions, some described spending several days a week undertaking their duties and they spoke of their need for support. Some have already set up support networks in their local deaneries, whilst others are offered support days from their local diocesan safeguarding team. One diocese described holding an open event where parish safeguarding officers could attend and ask for information about any issue that was causing them concern. These events are very well attended. This is another example of good practice which could be shared with other diocesan safeguarding teams wishing to support their local parish safeguarding officers.

INDEPENDENT CHAIR OF THE DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISORY PANEL

It was evident from discussions with diocesan safeguarding advisors, bishops and senior clergy that chairs play a pivotal role in supporting the diocesan safeguarding team, scrutinising safeguarding and supporting the implementation of the safeguarding training. Some chairs certainly champion safeguarding teams to ensure they are adequately resourced. Thus, the expertise, interest and commitment of the chair is vital.

- A. We have a positive relationship with our chair. The chair has put drive and energy into safeguarding and particularly training and increasing resources – the chair pushed through the need to recruit a training officer***
- B. We had a chair who was like that, but the current chair is more arms-length, I don't get a sense that the chair is interested in the work we are doing.***

Having met with a number of independent chairs at their networking day and some during the diocesan visits, it became apparent that they exercised their role differently. Some are paid a daily rate, some simply expenses and others are volunteers. There was no agreement during discussions on which approach was best, or which provided the greatest independent scrutiny over the safeguarding arrangements of a diocese. Yet, perhaps it should be noted that if no payment is made, independent chairs will largely be retired professionals with a suitable pension or have access to independent means – this may well preclude a large number of professionals of working age who specialise in safeguarding children and vulnerable adults from applying for an independent chair role.

Independent chairs need to be qualified enough to be able to challenge our practices. We pay our chair's expenses and time to ensure we have a quality chair.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

There were also concerns raised over the appointment process of independent chairs. Although national guidance suggests that these appointments should be advertised, it is evident that in some dioceses the bishop or a senior member of clergy may simply approach someone who they consider would be "ideal". It would appear that these particularly suitable candidates are frequently retired senior police officers or High Court judges. Of course, they may be "ideal", but many considered that a more open and transparent approach to selecting independent chairs should be used, because this would demonstrate that the Church is not reliant or drawn towards using some sort of "old boys" network.

Some chairs previously only dealt with the bishop and it was felt as though they were the bishop's adviser. This has changed in the last 2-3 years.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISORY PANELS

The diocesan safeguarding advisory panel is called a number of different names in dioceses e.g. the diocesan safeguarding group and diocesan safeguarding management group. Having different names for the same thing can cause confusion, prevent transparency and create inconsistency across the national Church.

In a number of dioceses, the diocesan safeguarding advisory panel (DSAP) only met twice a year. This is concerning, as a twice-yearly meeting is unlikely to be capable of assessing the progress of safeguarding training or be able to challenge practice and gauge the level of resource required to implement the Framework effectively. Furthermore, some of the diocesan safeguarding advisory panels have few colleagues from the statutory sector attending. Diocesan safeguarding advisors spoke of trying to increase the number and range of statutory agencies on panels, but they often found professionals unwilling to attend because of time constraints and lack of resources in the statutory sector.

5.3 Face-to-face safeguarding training is preferred

Basic awareness and foundation safeguarding training (C0 & C1) courses are available online or face-to-face in many dioceses. The discussions with church officers clearly demonstrated that face-to-face safeguarding training is preferred. The online versions of the core modules (C0 & C1) frequently raised concerns. People have difficulty logging on, some do not have access to computers or even have an email address. For some people the content can be disturbing and distressing, and it may bring up memories from the past. This is not ideal if they are undertaking the online training alone at home, where support is unavailable.

Face-to-face training has raised the profile of safeguarding and the safeguarding team in a positive way and a "whole diocesan team spirit" way, which we think

would be lost doing it online. So, we are going to continue to invest time and resources into encouraging face-to-face training.

(Safeguarding trainer)

In many instances, the face-to-face training is especially appreciated when it is delivered by a diocesan safeguarding advisor. The reason for this appeared to be twofold. First, the participants met the diocesan safeguarding advisor and therefore could "put a face to a name". This then gave them confidence to contact the diocesan safeguarding advisor in the future if an issue arose. Second, participants in the discussions explained that diocesan safeguarding advisors are often able to adapt the course material better to suit the audience and local circumstances, they also tended to use relevant examples from their casework which helped to bring the subject matter alive. Face-to-face training was also appreciated because it gave participants the opportunity to discuss scenarios with their peers.

Often in parishes we try to use examples of vulnerable adults and financial abuse as they are the issues they are more likely to be experiencing. I think people do come to safeguarding training thinking it is all about sexual abuse, and may not think more broadly.

(Volunteer trainer)

5.4 The training could be more accessible

A number of discussions took place about the accessibility of safeguarding training. There were some examples of training taking place in halls where the acoustics were particularly poor. Some venues did not have a loop system¹⁰ for people with hearing impairments. The dense text on the PowerPoint slides was problematic for those with visual impairments. Some participants highlighted that people with learning difficulties, dyslexia or poor literacy levels might also struggle with the density of the text in the presentations. Participants suggested that having a larger number of videos would help lead discussion topics.

It is always difficult to cater for the needs of every participant that you have attending a training session, though we do try. Things like disability access, loop systems, disabled toilets, warm venue etc. are all very much in my mind before I book a training venue. In very rural areas with not much light during the winter, we try to do the training sessions during the day so that people who don't want to come out in the dark feel safe to do so. During the winter we try to make sure that we have warm venues and that they are easy to get to in wintery conditions.

Diocesan Safeguarding Trainer

¹⁰ A hearing loop (sometimes called an audio induction loop) is a special type of sound system for use by people with hearing aids. The hearing loop provides a magnetic, wireless signal that is picked up by the hearing aid when it is set to 'T' (Telecoil) setting.

5.5 Greater clarity is needed around who requires what training. Despite the requirements for training being set out in the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework, large numbers of people continue to be confused about what training is required. This applies equally to dioceses, cathedrals and religious communities – only theological education institutions appear to understand the requirements. Participants asked for greater clarity about who is required to attend which training module. The range of different names for the same role across dioceses also appears to contribute to the confusion about who needs what training.

The progressive requirement of the programme is unhelpful and confusing. I have sought clarity from the National Safeguarding Team (NST) and they are also unclear. It was not helpful for the guidance to state that attendance at C1 and C2 is the equivalent of attending C3 as this contradicts the advice that it is progressive especially when I was told attendance at C3 is not the equivalent of C1 and C2. This was further exacerbated by the launch of C1 online module being so late after the launch of the guidance. As a diocese we decided to focus on the clergy and LLMs [licensed lay ministers] by delivering C3 in 2017 and then launching C2 in 2018. We are now having to ask those attending C3 to attend/undertake C1 and C2. The time and staff required to deliver the numbers of training sessions to comply with this is huge.

Diocesan safeguarding advisor

Actually, the modules are not progressive and therefore there is no need for anyone who has attended clergy training (C3) to also attend the foundation (C1) and leadership (C2) modules – yet, plenty of people remain confused.

5.6 The focus is on core training

Many of those participating in this review felt it was a huge burden trying to roll out all the core modules (C0, C1, C2 & C3) at the same time as introducing the specialist modules (S1 & S3). Therefore, diocesan safeguarding teams usually focus on the core modules. The rationale was that once everyone had attended the necessary core modules, the team could then start rolling out the specialist modules. Currently, courses such as "safer recruitment" and "domestic abuse" are often seen as additional and are not well attended or promoted. Nevertheless, there appears to be interest in the forthcoming "spiritual abuse" module. Those dioceses that have introduced the specialist modules frequently had trainers who were confident to teach subjects such as domestic abuse because they had experience of it in previous roles outside of the Church. Specialist modules, particularly the domestic abuse module, were more likely to be delivered by external trainers. This again highlights the need for specialist training for diocesan safeguarding advisors and trainers.

It is a similar picture for cathedrals. The questionnaires showed that the majority of cathedrals currently focus on providing the core safeguarding modules. Some stated that they would start a phased introduction of the specialist modules once staff and volunteers

have completed core modules. Interestingly, a number stated that they did not understand why the course on "responding to domestic abuse" (S3) was necessary – "*not highlighted the need for those in leadership or involved in pastoral support to attend*". Equally, another cathedral explained that there had been "*several murders in the city where domestic abuse and stalking had played a part*" which has raised the profile of domestic abuse.

5.7 Training modules have been adapted and combined

The enormity of the numbers of church officers who require training has led diocesan safeguarding teams to combine and tailor modules. This normally means reducing the number of slides and thus the length of the training session, but many have combined courses so individuals do not have to attend multiple sessions. Some do not use the core awareness module (C0) at all, whilst others have combined the foundation and leadership modules (C1 and C2). Only one diocese stated that they had not changed anything – the reason given was that they did not have the time to change the presentations.

I am not always convinced that more is better, more training, more policies and practice guidance. The more you complicate stuff, the less people can do with it. Who can work with a 120-page policy? You need a policy that you can reduce to a side of A4.

(Bishop)

Equally, some participants felt the training needed to be adapted, as there was little in the core safeguarding modules about diversity therefore gender, sexuality, disability and ethnicity are not being addressed.

The training also does not sufficiently address the issues of gender and sexual orientation in safeguarding in the church/ cathedral setting. The training process risks mirroring the very process that it is trying to protect.

(Safeguarding training officer)

5.8 Training equips church officers to perform their safeguarding responsibilities

Meetings with groups of church officers who had attended training provided invaluable information with plenty of open and honest reflection concerning the training. Inevitably, those attending the meetings were self-selecting and therefore their attitude towards safeguarding and training may have been more positive than those who chose not to be involved in the review. The large majority of participants found training (particularly face-to-face training) useful and they felt it equipped them for their role within the Church. This positive view of the safeguarding training extended across senior clergy, bishops, deans and archdeacons to incumbents, parish safeguarding officers, cathedral safeguarding leads to

volunteers – all reported feeling more confident and better equipped to handle issues around safeguarding.

5.9 There is some resistance to attending safeguarding training

During discussions with trainers, bishops and diocesan safeguarding advisors, retired clergy with permission to officiate are consistently identified as difficult to engage in safeguarding training. It frequently appears that retired clergy consider this training unnecessary to their role; this is because they do not regularly officiate at services. The Framework states that those "whose ministry will be active" should attend clergy training (C3) whereas those for whom permission to officiate will rarely be used, it may be more "practicable for core foundation training (C1) to be completed". The diocesan bishop (having sought the advice of the diocesan safeguarding advisor) has discretion to decide on the appropriate level of training. Again, this introduces a level of inconsistency.

Permission to officiate and unwillingness to revoke permission to officiate is an area of risk in safeguarding.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

Throughout discussions with bishops, diocesan safeguarding advisors, groups of church officers and clergy, it was evident that most bishops insist that anyone holding a license or holding permission to officiate should attend training (C3). There were examples cited of permission to officiate being withheld. Equally, in a number of dioceses the bishop was in the process of writing final letters to members of clergy explaining that their license will be removed if they do not attend safeguarding training by a certain date.

I co-deliver training with an archdeacon and this has led to it being better received.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

It was apparent from discussions with the diocesan safeguarding advisors and trainers that they are regularly confronted with aggressive participants during training sessions. This was principally evident during clergy training (C3). Often one attendee would refuse to engage or join in with the discussion taking place. Despite not engaging, participants still receive a certificate of attendance. A number of participants raised

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM A TRAINER

I just wanted to follow up from last week's meeting in London. There were a lot of negative comments regarding training and I just wanted to balance that with another perspective.

Our training delivery is going very well. We are able to deliver the full national offer plus some locally produced courses (C5 and personal safety) We get good feedback and largely engagement is good. We do have some negative participants but we tend to manage these people very tightly during the session to ensure they get as much as possible out of it and so they don't impact on the learning of others.

The resources are well received and often people say that the church training is more comprehensive than their occupational training at a teacher, nurse etc.

The [local] trainer forum meetings are still happening. All of the trainers are positive and are working hard to find innovative ways of embedding the training in a way that suits their diocese.

I think locally we have found some solutions to those issues people were raising at the national meeting. The training has been a really essential part of our cultural change here, so it was crucial to get it right.

We are now delivering our local version of the C5 (3 yearly refresher training) and its going very well so far.

(Diocesan trainer)

concerns about this and some suggested that some sort of process should exist to enable diocesan safeguarding advisors or trainers to report these individuals to the local bishop.

We had one clergy member who said 'we shouldn't worry about women crying because that's what women do'.

(Assistant curate)

On discussion, there were various approaches to improving clergy engagement. For example:

- Showing a video of the diocesan bishop at the beginning of the session explaining the importance of safeguarding in the Church setting
- Safeguarding advisors/trainers co-delivering training with a member of clergy
- Including more theological references and scripture into the session
- Having a senior member of clergy as a safeguarding "champion" with the diocese

Other resistance to attending safeguarding training came from older volunteers who had been "in post" for many years. Some appeared worried about the subject, or lacked the necessary computer skills to undertake the online core training (CO). Some are so elderly that travelling to training is problematic, whilst a number felt that safeguarding is not relevant to their role e.g. churchwardens and members of the parochial church council who consider that they do not come into contact with children or vulnerable adults.

One of our greatest achievements is having people attend who didn't want to be there and then saying at the end it was either the best or most valuable training they had been to.

(Diocesan safeguarding trainer)

5.10 Requests for advice and support have increased

Dioceses and cathedrals consistently stated that it was too early in the implementation to assess whether the training is making a difference to the number of formal referrals made to statutory agencies. There is, however, plenty of anecdotal evidence to suggest that not only are diocesan safeguarding advisors receiving more requests for advice and support (from parishes etc.), but these conversations are more appropriate i.e. they concern safeguarding issues.

One knock on effect of training is that the more we do, the more calls come in.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

5.11 The response to victims and survivors

As part of this review, the project lead asked to meet with victims/survivors during the diocesan visits. The purpose was to find out whether they had been listened to, heard and supported when they disclosed abuse. In many cases individuals declined to be involved – many victims/survivors (understandably) did not wish to speak about their experience. Three people were, however, kind enough to add their thoughts to the review. In all these

cases, they felt extremely well supported by the diocesan safeguarding advisor. They had been signposted to additional support for services such as counselling and they were grateful for the response they had received.

Realistically, it is too early to tell whether safeguarding training has helped create an environment where individuals feel confident to disclose abuse in the knowledge that they will be heard and supported. Many diocesan safeguarding advisors and trainers however reported that participants often made disclosures of historical abuse (such as domestic abuse) following training sessions.

5.12 The impact of a significant safeguarding issue in the past

The discussions and meetings that took place showed that cathedrals, dioceses and parishes are more likely to focus on safeguarding if there had been a significant safeguarding problem in the past. These areas recognise the importance of safeguarding, have greater commitment towards it, they are more likely to discuss safeguarding regularly at meetings, link with other church bodies, scrutinise their volunteers and staff more closely and have a good working relationship with their local diocesan safeguarding advisor. They are also more likely to invest in safeguarding both in terms of financial resources as well as staff resources. Where significant safeguarding incidents had taken place, those involved reported feeling well supported by their diocesan safeguarding advisor.

A few members of clergy in discussion groups were so deeply affected by what had taken place in their respective parishes, that they requested training or support specifically aimed at how to handle situations where a safeguarding allegation or prosecution had "blown apart" the parish and congregation. Other members of clergy asked for training that would enable them to identify when they were being controlled and manipulated by others within their working environment.

5.13 The importance of support and commitment from clergy

The commitment from senior clergy is important so that safeguarding is not viewed as "something added on" but rather part of the ministry of the Church. There is a danger that safeguarding is viewed as belonging to diocesan safeguarding advisors, parish safeguarding officers and cathedral safeguarding leads, rather than an issue for everyone who works or worships within the Church.

The commitment of bishops, deans and senior clergy is particularly important as some clergy are seen as those most resistant to any form of safeguarding training and senior clergy are ideally placed to ensure safeguarding becomes central to the Church's ministry and mission.

Many participants thought that having more women in senior roles within the Church created a more balanced atmosphere. Indeed, many considered that women bring more sensitivity and inclusivity. Participants felt strongly that the Church must change and have

more women in senior positions – "*there is an attitude of 'old boys' club' and looking out for one another, and as more women come in those attitudes could change.*" Concerns were raised about the churches where there are no women in leadership positions.

There are no women in leadership positions in some churches – particularly the Anglo-Catholic churches where they do not recognise female bishops. They are less likely to respond appropriately to victims of domestic abuse, if female, and may say 'you're not being a good wife'. They are also less likely to accept the authority of the diocesan safeguarding team, as we are females in positions of authority. The domestic abuse training does not go down as well with them.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

The support and commitment from senior clergy must also translate into responsibility and accountability. Some diocesan safeguarding advisors described having very limited contact with their diocesan bishop – "*we're supposed to meet twice a year, but it hasn't always worked out that frequently*". In a number of dioceses, the contact was less formal and much more regular. The diocesan safeguarding advisors in those areas felt supported in their work and confident to speak directly to the diocesan bishop if they had concerns.

I don't think our diocesan secretary 'gets' safeguarding in terms of resourcing. We had to fight for a trainer and the admin assistant post. I got the bishop and archdeacons to back me, but I know if that had not been the case then there would not have been approval for those posts.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

Nevertheless, it is not just senior clergy who need to show their commitment to safeguarding. From discussions with groups of parish safeguarding officers, it was clear that clergy are instrumental in promoting safeguarding at parish level – "*as a parish safeguarding officer, it is difficult to enforce that this must be done, without clergy support. Some don't see me as being someone who can tell them what to do.*"

What made my church sit up was when I had to stand up and read a statement from the bishop about the person that had gone to prison. They were shocked, because it was someone they respected, and it made them start to listen to what I have been saying for years.

(Parish safeguarding officer)

5.14 Theological education institutions are key

From discussions it became apparent that theological education institutions should be a key component in driving change, both cultural change and a change in attitudes. Theological education institutions are well placed not only to ensure that those going through the selection process are suitable for the role, but also that ordinands understand that safeguarding is the "bread and butter" work of the Church and should be intertwined within their ministry.

Nonetheless, theological education institutions are disparate in the way in which they currently provide safeguarding training. Only one described a formal arrangement with their local diocese and most appeared to have safeguarding training as a separate course added on at the end. Ideally, thought should be given to how safeguarding can be part and parcel of theological education.

There is no doubt that the training has had a massive effect on how people view safeguarding and their responses to it, before I arrived people had a general misconception that safeguarding was an urban issue, we have since through the training, dispelled that myth. People seem to be getting passionate about it and talking about it throughout the diocese in such a positive way. People feel that safeguarding is becoming pro-active rather than always being re-active and most people see that safeguarding is fundamental to flourishing Christian communities.

Diocesan safeguarding advisor

5.15 The importance of support from the National Safeguarding Team

Information from both the questionnaires and the diocesan visits showed that many participants want further support from the National Safeguarding Team. Participants want clarity about the training, who should be trained and at what level. Some want training so they can present the training better. Others want their views to be heard and changes made to the current safeguarding training (in terms of length of modules, the number of slides and the number of courses available).

At present, there appears to be tension between standardising things such as training and roles and then allowing dioceses, cathedrals, religious communities and theological education institutions to be autonomous and do their own thing. An example of this was apparent when one diocese declined to be involved in the visits. The National Safeguarding Team must have the authority and influence to be able to hold individuals and church bodies to account – to insist that certain things are done. The national Church must decide whether safeguarding should be more centrally controlled or continue to allow church bodies to be independent – as it stands, autonomy is leading to inconsistency.

The whole thing about safeguarding is the deference. The Church of England loves hierarchy, and that is where the challenge needs to be.

(Diocesan safeguarding advisor)

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that the introduction of the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework has been a necessary part of standardising safeguarding across the national Church. It is also clear that safeguarding training needs to continue. Dioceses have welcomed the standardised modules, but many feel they will never be able to implement the Framework in its entirety because it is simply too ambitious.

The feedback from all training in this diocese has consistently been very high, with a large number of people who have received training elsewhere (including local safeguarding children board training) commenting that the diocesan training is the best they have ever done.

(Diocesan safeguarding trainer)

In many ways this evaluation may have come too soon – many dioceses have not had the opportunity to begin to roll out the training. Much of this delay appears to be around lack of funding for additional assistant diocesan safeguarding advisor and specialist trainer posts, with some areas needing a two-year lead-in for funding to become available. Hence in some areas, trainers have only recently been employed. This report therefore can only provide a snapshot of safeguarding training in 2018. What it was not able to do was answer with clarity many of the questions raised in the terms of reference.

The reference group set out a series of issues that the group thought should be explored in order to understand how the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework was being implemented. The review established that church officers who have attended training are sure that the training has equipped them to confidently develop and maintain safe practice. The church officers who participated in this review felt they had a good understanding of their safeguarding duties and responsibilities as set out in the practice guidance. Nevertheless, it was apparent that there was considerable disparity in the progress that individual dioceses, cathedrals, religious communities and theological education institutions had made in implementing the training. Some had worked hard to provide training to many church officers, whilst others were at the beginning of this journey. Therefore, there were some questions that this review and indeed the participants themselves could not answer. For example, whether the training had had a direct impact on the number of referrals made to statutory agencies, whether there had been a reduction in the time taken to identify and raise concerns, or whether there was an improvement in the support offered to victims, survivors and ex-offenders. Despite this, there was anecdotal evidence to show that discussions between church officers and with diocesan safeguarding advisors have increased and that there are good working relationships between diocesan safeguarding advisors and the statutory agencies.

The general consensus from participants in this review, is that things are beginning to change. There is a greater focus on safeguarding. People are beginning to understand that it is something that affects children, young people and adults who are vulnerable. There is

certainly a greater understanding that any adult can be vulnerable at certain times during their life e.g. following a bereavement, illness or family breakdown. There is also a better understanding that this is not always about sexual abuse, there are other types of abuse such as neglect, financial abuse or abuse of power. There is also the realisation that safeguarding training is not a one-off event and both the focus on safeguarding and the safeguarding training are here to stay.

Despite all this improvement, those participating still considered that it would take many years, if not decades, to change the culture of the Church.

"It will take quite some time to turn this particular ship"

Although these words were those of an assistant curate, the sentiment was reiterated by other church officers including bishops, deans, diocesan safeguarding advisors and parish safeguarding officers. Participants felt that we are a long way from seeing a Church where men and women are equal, where there is less deference to those in power and where everyone's voice is heard and respected equally. Participants felt that until some of these changes are ingrained, safeguarding will remain on the periphery.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

i. The National Safeguarding Team must urgently review the number and content of the safeguarding modules.

In order to do this, the Team should consider reviewing the wealth of information from the questionnaires and discussions about how the modules have been combined and adapted. This will help to address a number of issues that were raised by this review including:

- Budget and resource planning
- Dioceses' ability to forecast future training requirements
- The confusion about who should attend what training
- Revising the number of specialist modules together with decisions about whether these should be provided centrally, or externally by specialist organisations such as Women's Aid (domestic abuse training) and Barnardo's (child sexual exploitation training).
- Adapting the training to help those with learning difficulties, dyslexia or poor literacy levels engage more fully
- Providing additional training specifically aimed at diocesan safeguarding trainers to help prepare them to present the national safeguarding modules
- The possibility of introducing support or additional training for those clergy who are required to handle extremely sensitive and complex safeguarding situations

- ii. A process should be introduced (with guidance from the National Safeguarding Team) to enable diocesan safeguarding trainers to report to their local bishop any member of clergy who attends training and does not engage.**

This will give bishops the opportunity to understand where there is resistance to training and enable them to identify whether a member of clergy needs to repeat their safeguarding training or requires some other type of sanction.

- iii. There needs to be clarity about whether formal training arrangements should always exist between a diocese and the cathedral, theological education institutions and the religious communities in its area.**

Clarity around arrangements between dioceses, cathedrals, theological education institutions and religious communities will alleviate some of the current confusion around roles and responsibilities including whose duty it is to provide and finance safeguarding training

- iv. The Church must decide whether there should be stronger central guidance and oversight of safeguarding.**

This would enable the National Safeguarding Team to consider a number of issues that were raised during the course of this review including:

- Induction for new diocesan safeguarding advisors and trainers
- Regular training and professional development for diocesan safeguarding advisors and trainers
- Methods of identifying and sharing good practice
- Selection, appointment, role and remuneration of independent chairs
- Supervision of diocesan safeguarding advisors
- Out of hours services.

- v. Dioceses must use the terms set out in national guidance**

To avoid confusion and aid consistency, dioceses should all use the same terms when referring to specific church bodies and roles e.g. diocesan safeguarding advisory panel, diocesan safeguarding advisors and parish safeguarding officers. These are already set out in national Church guidance.

8 APPENDIX: Core modules of safeguarding training

Diagram to show the core modules of the Safeguarding Training and Development Framework

