

Wednesday 9 February 2022

9.00 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.

ORDER PAPER II

HOLY COMMUNION

SAFEGUARDING (GS 2244)

9 Presentation under SO 107

***Note:** The Business Committee has determined under SO 107(3) that this presentation should include an opportunity for questions*

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Nottingham), pursuant to SO 107(4)(b), to move a further motion arising out of item 9 as follows:

- 22** 'That this Synod expresses its disapproval of the Safeguarding report GS 2244 for the following reasons:
- a. The report persists in referring to “Vulnerable” persons – a terminology which has been deemed to be derogatory and restrictive to the understanding of its applicability – which was replaced by the term “Adults At Risk of Abuse or Neglect” under the Care Act 2014 in recognition of the dynamic nature of the Risk of Abuse in relation to individuals.
 - b. The report makes no reference to the creation of Key Performance Indicators for the operation of the National Safeguarding Team (NST) in order to address the very many real and valid concerns that have been raised about its focus, effectiveness and method of operating. For a Team comprising 26.5 FTE’s which includes consultants, the absence of such Key Performance Indicators represents a substantial weakness in the management of a resource which represents a considerable ongoing financial commitment.

- c. It does not provide any detail which would enable the Synod to form a view about the NST's effectiveness in making the Church of England a safe place for its entire worshipping community and for those who work for it in a remunerated or voluntary basis.
- d. The report shows a praiseworthy focus on sexual and spiritual abuse, but it makes no mention of bullying in the Church which is widely acknowledged to be a serious issue within churches, nor does it propose how and how bullying can be addressed.
- e. It demonstrates a piece-meal approach to safeguarding development by the NST rather than the wholesale reform that is needed.
- f. The report does not address the concerns raised in paragraph 8(f) of the first report of the Independent Safeguarding Board, which is attached as an appendix to GS 2244 – concerns that have been raised both privately and publicly with and about the NST by many people over recent years.
- g. Given that the ISB report states in its paragraph 6 that "It [The Board] does not have powers to sanction, direct, regulate, inspect or insist" there is no provision within the safeguarding arrangements for any independent external scrutiny with powers to intervene in cases where negligence, misconduct or performance failures are alleged or identified; nor does it indicate how the NST and the national safeguarding functions of the Church of England can intervene in cases where bishops and dioceses are not following good safeguarding practice or following the codes of practice or guidance.

This Synod therefore calls for a full independent assessment of the work and performance reporting of the NST and the myriad national safeguarding bodies of the Church of England; for this evaluation to be published in full; and for a debate on its contents at a future Group of Sessions to enable the Synod to be fully engaged in the decisions about

the future direction and shape of the Church of England's safeguarding work.'

SPECIAL AGENDA I LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

THE FACULTY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) RULES 2022 (GS 2245)

The Chair of the Rule Committee (the Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC, Dean of the Arches and Auditor) (ex officio) to move:

- 500A** 'That the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 be considered.'

The Revd Marcus Walker (London) to move:

- 501** 'Leave out rule 2'

Explanatory statement: this amendment would remove the requirement for a person proposing to undertake work which comes within the net zero guidance issued by the Church Buildings Council to have due regard to that guidance in formulating the proposal.

Item 502 will be moved if Item 501 is carried

- 502** 'Leave out rule 6'

Explanatory statement: this amendment is consequential on the amendment to leave out rule 2.

The Revd Marcus Walker (London) to move the following amendments:

- 503** 'In the Schedule, in paragraph 5, in sub-paragraph (1), *leave out* paragraph (b) to (d).

In the Schedule, in paragraph 5, in sub-paragraph (1), leave out paragraph (f).

In the Schedule, in paragraph 5, leave out sub-paragraph (2) and (3).'

Explanatory statement: these amendments would remove the amendments relating to the replacement of boilers and would accordingly ensure that a proposal to replace a boiler using the existing fuel supply will remain on List A and a proposal to replace a boiler using a different fuel supply will remain on List B. The amendments would retain the proposed inclusion in List A of the replacement of a flue liner.

If item 503 is not carried

The Ven Luke Irvine-Capel (Chichester) to move

504 ‘In the Schedule, in paragraph 5, *leave out* sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) and *insert*—

“(1) In matter A1 in List A (church building etc.), leave out paragraph (7) (replacement of boiler utilising existing fuel supply).

(2) In matter B1 in List B (church building etc.), for the text in the first column (including the text in parentheses) substitute—

“The replacement of a boiler—

- a. whether in the same or substantially the same location,
- b. whether utilising an existing fuel supply or a different fuel supply, and
- c. whether with existing or similar pipe runs.”.’

Explanatory statement: this amendment would provide that any proposal to replace a boiler would be included in List B and therefore subject to consultation with the archdeacon. It would not be necessary to seek a petition for any such proposal.

The Ven Fiona Gibson (Hereford) to move:

505 ‘In the Schedule, after paragraph 14 insert—

“Broadband equipment

14A.—(1) In matter B1 in List B (church buildings etc.), after paragraph (11) *insert—*

“(11A) The installation of equipment for receiving, or for receiving and sharing, wireless and broadband services

The equipment does not adversely affect the church’s protection against lightning
Any cable runs are secured so as to minimise the risk that they become loose
Details of the equipment, its proposed location and the location and securing of any cable runs are submitted to the archdeacon when the archdeacon is consulted on the proposal to undertake the matter

In the formulation of those details, regard is had to the desirability of avoiding loss of or damage to historic material

The diocesan registrar is consulted on the terms of any proposed contract for the sharing of the wireless broadband services”.’

‘In matter B5 in List B (church halls etc.), after paragraph (4) (inserted by paragraph 10(2)) *insert—*

“(5) The installation of equipment for receiving, or for receiving and sharing, wireless broadband services

The equipment does not adversely affect the building’s protection against lightning
Any cable runs are secured so as to minimise the risk that they become loose

Details of the equipment, its proposed location and the location and securing of any cable runs are submitted to the archdeacon when the archdeacon is consulted on the proposal to undertake the matter

In the formulation of those details, regard is had to the desirability of avoiding loss of or damage to historic material

The diocesan registrar is consulted on the terms of any proposed contract for the sharing of the wireless broadband services”.’

Explanatory statement: this amendment would include in List B a proposal to install on the exterior of a church building, or of a church hall or similar building, equipment for receiving (and, if desired, sharing) wireless broadband services. The proposal would be subject to conditions, including providing the archdeacon with details of the proposed installation and having regard to the desirability of avoiding loss or damage to material which is of historic or architectural significance.

The Chair of the Rule Committee (the Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC, Dean of the Arches and Auditor) (ex officio) to move:

500B ‘That the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2022 [as amended] be approved.’